

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 31, 1878.

The Week.

THE end of another week finds Congress still absorbed by the "silver question," to the exclusion of almost all other interests and considerations. On Wednesday week Mr. Blaine appeared in the Senate with a compromise bill which deservedly finds favor with neither party. It permits the unlimited coinage of silver dollars of a certain value (undefined in the bill) in exchange for bullion at its current market value, as from time to time determined, plus the cost of coinage; these dollars to be legal tender, by themselves, only to the extent of five dollars, but in conjunction with gold to the extent of one-half of any debt. In contrast with this weak-kneed performance, Mr. Lamar, the next day, honored himself and the South by boldly taking his stand in favor of a gold standard and national honesty. The vote on the Matthews resolution at length took place on Friday. Mr. Conkling's motion to make it a joint (and therefore vetoable) resolution was defeated by 39 to 23; Mr. Edmunds's contradictory amendment, declaring the bonds payable in gold coin and characterizing their payment in depreciated silver as a breach of the public faith, was defeated by 44 to 18, Mr. Blaine declining to vote on account of some historic doubts on these points; Mr. Morrill's amendment, denouncing payment in silver as false economy, was defeated by 41 to 14; Mr. Edmunds's motion for indefinite postponement was defeated by 43 to 22; and finally, by 43 to 22 again (Mr. Blaine this time voting with the minority), the Senate affirmed, in the language of the original resolution, that all the bonds issued for the purpose of funding the national debt are payable, legally and equitably, at the option of the Government, in the dollar of the fathers, both principal and interest. On Monday the House, without debate, and by more than a two-thirds vote, 189 to 79, adopted the same resolution. More unexpected was the action of the House, also on Monday, when called upon by Mr. Baker, of Indiana, to suspend the rules and resolve that subsidies of whatsoever kind, to associations engaged in public or private enterprises, ought not to be granted or renewed by Congress. This resolution was carried by a vote of 175 to 82. On Friday the Judiciary Committee reported that there had been no breach of the privileges of the House in the case of Robert Smalls. On Tuesday, the House passed, not without opposition (167 to 100), the bill permitting the Woodruff expedition to register a foreign-built ship. As we lately pointed out, there is not a shadow of excuse for this special legislation, the real design of which is not to get a cheaper ship but to invest a private speculation with a national sanction. We hope the Senate will ask for light as to Mr. Woodruff and his intentions, and will also notice the warning of a correspondent on another page.

The Matthews resolution, which in terms only attacks the new bonds issued for refunding purposes under the Acts of 1870 and 1875, but of course casts discredit on all Government obligations, is already making itself felt in foreign markets. It was supported by 116 Democrats and 73 Republicans, and opposed by 56 Republicans and 23 Democrats. In other words, neither party could have carried it through as a party question; it has needed a combination, and these combinations are now so readily made that it is increasingly difficult to say what the existing party organizations are kept up for or what they mean. But the great fact remains that the majority of both parties voted for the resolution. It got but little support from the New England or the Middle States, and a great deal from the South and West. On the whole, if the vote be taken as an indication of the fate of the Bland Bill the prospect is rather gloomy; but we still adhere to the belief that if the bill be vetoed, there will be enough desertions to prevent its

second passage. If the veto were accompanied by a masterly message, making a clear stand for the national credit, the chance of its defeat would be still greater. To override the veto 195 votes will be necessary, or six more than the Matthews resolution received.

It is noteworthy that during the debate in the Senate the burden of the opposition to the Matthews resolution and the silver movement generally has been borne by Senators Edmunds and Morrill, both from a small agricultural State. Mr. Conkling, representing a great commercial constituency, said nothing or next to nothing. We observe, however, that, as usual, his admirers are again beginning to stir him up and urge him to speak and bring his "great powers to bear," etc. It is probable, however, that he is keeping his great powers for things that interest him more. Mr. Blaine's attempts at legislation, and, indeed, at political suggestion generally, bear a strong resemblance to Mr. Burnand's "Happy Thoughts"—that is, they have a haphazard, jerky, and slightly droll air. "Happy thought—Constitutional amendment to protect schools from the Pope; happy thought—stir up Ben Hill; happy thought—make Evarts go to war with Mexico; happy thought—compromise with silver-men; make half-and-half legal tender for all amounts; trouble over, business revived, country grateful."

That the cry for "salvation by silver" was started by politicians for their own ends, that the movement was fanned by false statements as to the manner in which the silver dollar was dropped from the coinage, and that it is now a delusion which has temporarily deprived of reason a large number of the people of this country, are facts which few, even of the "silver-men" in Congress, will deny. The Bland bill cannot give to any section of the country, or to any class of persons, the relief which is expected from it, and it must bring with it disaster and irreparable injury to the whole country. The time is now too short for us to hope to control votes on the Bland bill by arguments addressed to the people of the West and South. But one course is left to those who would save the country from lasting disgrace and injury, and that is to demand of the men of ability and courage who represent in Congress the people of the South and West that they shall speak and vote boldly against any silver bill that would permit the United States to pay any portion of its debt in debased dollars. There are many men in the Senate of the United States who know that the Bland bill means the demonetization of gold by debasing the coinage. This week they will try honestly to amend the bill. If they fail to amend it, they will be face to face with the question "Shall I vote for it or against it?" The courage of a few men will determine the answer of many. Who will follow Mr. Lamar in boldly telling his constituents that they are mistaken as to the effect of the silver movement upon their interests?

The Silver League, or Greenback and Silver Association, as it is called, held another meeting on Monday, at which it was proposed that money should be raised to pay for documents to be distributed in those parts of the country in which there appeared to be most darkness as to the beneficent powers of silver; but nobody was prompt to offer anything except General Butler, and he only \$50. The discussion, too, was mainly conducted by him, and ran mostly on the best means of keeping the Secretary of the Treasury up to his work and making him carry out the Bland Bill, so "that silver may be a living power in the land." For this purpose Butler hinted that it might be necessary for the House to use its power of making him report to it in person. In fact, the Secretary was evidently an object of suspicion to the meeting, and they mean in case the bill is passed to keep a close eye on him. The one way in which he could work mischief under the bill would be to call in a batch of United States bonds and pay them off in silver. A blow would be thus given to the national credit from which it would probably not recover in a century, if ever.

Several leading citizens of New Haven, including Dr. Woolsey, Mr. English, Dr. Bacon, and others, have petitioned Congress for what may be called the only rational and honest mode of making silver a legal tender, and that is for the appointment of an international commission, having power to determine and promulgate authoritatively, from time to time, the relative value of silver and gold, so that in the payment of debts, at home and abroad, the quantity of coined silver which shall be the equivalent of any given quantity of gold coin may be everywhere definitely acknowledged; and until such a commission shall be appointed, the creation of machinery by Congress for ascertaining and promulgating, at intervals of three months, the value of silver in gold, as determined by the average sales of silver at the principal centres of commerce east and west of the Rocky Mountains. In other words, they ask for one standard and two legal tenders. We know of no objection to this plan on its merits; and we can anticipate no answer to it from the silver-men except "gold-ites," "gold-bugs," "gold sharps," "Shylocks," "Mississippi Valley," and so on.

The Louisiana Returning Board has again come before the public in a way that reminds one of the good old Grant days. The members were all four indicted for forging and altering returns at the late Presidential election, and recently applied to have their case transferred to the United States Court. This motion the State Court denied, and ordered the case to trial, and at the appointed hour they failed to put in an appearance, and it was found they had taken refuge from arrest in the Custom-house. This was sufficiently amusing, but what followed was more amusing still, for the acting collector and the United States marshal resisted the sheriff when he came to arrest the fugitives, and brought up a party of marines to protect them, and, indeed, the marshal arrested the sheriff. The State was for so many years governed from the Custom-house without any reference to the law of the land that both collector and marshal had evidently come to look on it as a privileged spot on which the writs of the courts did not run. It was not for some little time that they thought of telegraphing to Washington for instructions, and of course the Attorney-General promptly rebuked the Federal officials for their interference. Anderson, Kenner, and Casanave were therefore taken into custody; but Wells managed to make his escape, and is said to be on his way to Washington to claim protection, in default of which he threatens to make "developments." He is the greatest rascal of the four, and it is therefore a pity that he should have got off, but it would be a not inappropriate incident in his career that he should now "develop" in Washington. The whole party are very blue about their prospects, being afraid of a prejudiced jury. There are, however, two colored men on it. It will be a pity if they have any reasonable ground for disputing the justice of the verdict, if they are found guilty; but every lover of good government will be sorry if they get off without punishment. That Anderson should have an office in New Orleans under this Administration is one of the scandals of the day. The trial is now proceeding, and there is talk of summoning W. E. Chandler to prove the story produced in his late letter.

The Richmond Chamber of Commerce, in full accord with its sister bodies at Charleston and New Orleans as to the sacredness of public obligations, whether State or national, has just issued an address upon the public debt of Virginia. They say that the aggressive activity of those who demand its repudiation, and the apathy of the rest of the community, "have impaired private credit to such a degree that the merchants and manufacturers of Richmond, in justice to themselves, are compelled to express their views upon this vital question, and to take such action as in their opinion will tend to check the current of popular sentiment which seems to be hurrying Virginia to moral and material bankruptcy." They show that the debt proper is less than \$31,000,000; that it has always been recognized by the Legislature as legitimate, and justly, since the

"bonds were sold to *bona-fide* purchasers, many of them at prices above their par value, and the money paid for them was invested in building railroads, canals, turnpikes, colleges, schools, asylums, prisons, and other valuable works of internal improvement" (including the monument to Washington in the Capitol grounds), "from which the State is now deriving incalculable advantage"; that the whole debt is not due nor required to be paid at once; that the interest alone need be provided for, and can be met by an additional tax of about \$700,000 annually, or three-fourths of one per cent.; that supporting the public credit now at this small sacrifice will enable the State in 1881 to pay its debt in bonds bearing four per cent. interest at par. They attribute the present demoralization on the subject of the debt to the bad legislation after the war, designed to impair the sanctity of contracts and impede creditors in the courts, and they find in it the cause of dishonest returns to assessors and dishonest assessments, of courts and grand juries winking at notorious evasions, of honest men forced to continue paying the taxes of the dishonest, "of communism, strikes, and the crimes incident thereto." In short, the address is in a high degree sound, earnest, and forcible. It is refreshing, too, to meet with an unblushing appeal to "debt-paying people," that respectable body of citizens throughout the country who have come to be regarded with distrust, while the merits of the "debtor class" have been asserted with so much vigor and persistency that a man who insists upon returning 100 cents for a borrowed dollar, instead of 90, is looked upon less as a fool than as a pernicious knave.

The adoption by the United States Senate of the Matthews resolution had no perceptible effect on the financial markets. Apparently it was reasoned that the vote showed that there was not strength enough to pass the Bland Bill. The vote of the House, however, on Monday, with its more than two-thirds majority, aided by plausible rumors that the President's opposition to the silver scheme was growing weaker, had the effect of shaking confidence in the defeat of remonetization, which had hitherto existed both here and in London. United States bonds in London fell on Tuesday 1 to 1½ per cent., and the price of gold here advanced from 101½ to 102½. That the Bland Bill, if it becomes a law, will defeat the resumption of gold payments by the Treasury is beyond question, since the Resumption Act provides for gold payments only, in the absence of any authorized silver dollar at the time the Act was passed. That it will also make it impossible to maintain resumption in gold and silver should an attempt be made to carry out the Act is equally clear, unless by the first of January, 1879, the price of silver so advances as to make a 412½-grain dollar equivalent in value, or nearly so, to the gold dollar. Silver during the week has been steady in London at 53½ to 53¾d. per oz. At the close of the week the gold value of a 412½ grain-silver dollar would have been \$0.8933. The Secretary of the Treasury on Monday opened for popular subscriptions the United States 4 per cent. loan. The price at which the bonds are offered is 99½ gold, the banks and agents which sell them to the public getting them from the Treasury at 99½ gold—the same as did the Syndicate. The day after the bonds were brought out they could be bought at the Stock Exchange at 98½ gold, taking the accrued interest into account.

The British Ministry is apparently plunged in the greatest embarrassment by the Russian terms of peace, the principal points of which, so far as known, we have discussed in an article elsewhere. They appear, when communicated in substance by Count Shuvaloff, to have taken the Cabinet by surprise, and to have found them in a very nervous condition, as the despatch of the fleet to the Dardanelles on hearing one story, and its sudden recall on hearing another, showed. Accordingly, it has been determined to ask for the supplemental vote for the army and navy, and Sir Stafford Northcote having announced that the Ministry will treat it as a vote of confidence, the Liberals are prepared with an amendment, and the

debate, which is expected to last to the end of the week, is now going on. There is little doubt, however, that the Government will secure a majority—estimated at fifty—and just as little that if defeated and forced to dissolve Parliament, their foreign policy would be condemned by the constituencies. The class of men of whom the Conservative majority in the House is mainly composed are, through social influences and prejudices, mostly Turcophiles, and it is safe to say, if one can judge by the ordinary manifestations of popular feeling, do not on this question represent the country. Mr. Trevelyan, the biographer of Macaulay, in a recent speech described the Turkish sympathizers happily:

“Our army is all for the Turks. Our navy is all for the Turks. Our country-houses are all for the Turks. All loafers of every degree and rank, all that class of men who go about in clubs, or drawing-rooms, or taverns, intent on forming what they are pleased to call public opinion, are one and all for the Turks. The London newspapers are, for the most part, writing on the same side with an alacrity which I have never seen applied to any previous controversy. Epithets of extraordinary bitterness, wholesale accusations of cant, hypocrisy, absence of patriotism, want of common manliness are applied to men whose only crime is that they wish their countrymen to wash their hands of all responsibility for Turkish misrule and Christian misery.”

Mr. Foster is to move the Liberal amendment in the House of Commons, and the Marquis of Hartington to close the debate. The amendment simply declares that as it is acknowledged that the conditions of British neutrality have not been infringed by either belligerent, “the House sees no reason for adding to the people's burdens by voting additional supplies.” On this motion, pure and simple, the Ministry would probably receive the votes of a good many Liberals who would like to see England prepared for all eventualities; but the vote having been made a question of confidence, the probabilities are that the whole Liberal strength will be thrown solidly against the Ministry, and great exertions are making on both sides to secure a full house for the division. Lord Derby has withdrawn his resignation, on the countermanding of the order to the fleet to enter the Dardanelles, but it is still feared that if the Ministry get a good majority Beaconsfield will take the bit in his teeth and make some hostile demonstration against Russia. Whether the Liberals will be helped or hindered by the deplorable condition of trade it would be hard to say. The ultimate effects of the war would, of course, be bad, but many will like the prospects of the immediate fillip it would give to certain branches. The debate promises to be the most exciting since the Crimean war.

There is undoubtedly still a considerable degree of vagueness about the Russian demands, and they are capable of great expansion in execution, as Sir Stafford Northcote has pointed out. This is doubtless partly due to the fact that the negotiations being carried on in the Russian headquarters are shaped by what is called “the military party,” between whom and the civilian diplomatists, headed by Gortchakoff, there is a constant struggle for ascendancy. Now, the military party naturally does not want peace just yet, or not before they get to Constantinople. Having got into the way of thrashing the Turks, they like it, and wish to keep at it as long as there are any Turks to thrash. Moreover, as it is quite certain that the conditions of peace will have to be settled or passed upon by a European conference, Russia naturally makes her terms on every point as high as possible, and perhaps as vague as possible, partly to frighten the Turks and partly to allow plenty of room for reduction. The weight of England's remonstrances will doubtless, now that the Turks are out of the way, depend on the probability of her receiving support from Austria. Russia does not care for the fleet, and no army she could send to Turkey would make much impression, especially against the general rising of the Christians, which is impending and might be easily provoked.

If Mr. Sumner's doctrine of neutral hostility were applied to England in the present case the results would be very comic. In

the first place, she is liable to the Russians for the prolongation of the war by sympathizing with and encouraging the Turks. Sir William Harcourt says that this prolongation has amounted to the six weeks since the fall of Plevna. The Russians would probably put it down at half the period since the Danube was crossed, that is, about three months, which, supposing the total Russian outlay to be \$500,000,000, would make her debt to Russia \$250,000,000. After the late civil war here, however, the total destruction of one of the belligerents left her only the other to settle with; but in this case Turkey has survived, and may fairly claim compensation also for the disappointment of reasonable expectations. It is true that she was officially warned at the outset that England would remain neutral; but the language of the Prime Minister and of an important portion of the press since then has fairly warranted her in believing that, if hard pressed, England would come to her aid. So that half the cost of the war, as well as compensation for the loss of provinces with which she is threatened, would seem not more than she has a right to ask, which would bring the expense of the war to England up to about \$700,000,000 at a moderate computation, which, added to the Sumner liability in our war, would make a grand total of about \$3,000,000,000, incurred without ever firing a shot, by simply looking on and shouting and calling names.

The most one can gather with any approach to certainty from the telegraphic news as to the situation in Turkey is that the Russians are slowly moving down on Adrianople, carrying with them, doubtless, the Turkish plenipotentiaries; but they have apparently no disposition to conclude a formal armistice or to suspend operations while treating. In this, humanly speaking, they are right, for the Turks, who are now so frightened as to be willing to sign anything to save Constantinople, would probably pick up a little courage and perhaps some shreds of military organization if the Russians halted to negotiate. The panic among the Mussulman population of Rumelia continues, and they are flying *en masse* to Constantinople, many of them frantically eager to get over into Asia. The Circassians are adding to the horrors of the scene by plundering all impartially, without regard to race or creed, and bringing their booty into Constantinople, where the Government would like to disarm them, but has not force enough for the purpose. Austria has apparently been a little alarmed by the expansiveness of the reported terms of peace, but Russia is apparently determined to leave nothing undone to satisfy her, and Count Shuvaloff has given the most positive assurances in London that the opening of the Dardanelles is to be treated as a European question, and is to be settled by the Powers. The only point, indeed, on which the victor is reported to be obstinate is the cession of the Rumanian piece of Bessarabia.

In France the broken spirit of the Right has been illustrated in the election of the Duc d'Audriffet-Pasquier as President of the Senate by 172 to 64 votes cast, and there were 61 blank ballots, put in by irreconcilable Legitimists and Bonapartists who hated the duke too much to vote for him, but, having no candidate of their own, had not the courage to vote against him. A decree has been issued stopping all press prosecutions for offences committed between the 16th of May and the 14th of December, and, to crown all, General Ducrot has been removed from his command, as he was suspected of counselling or being ready to participate in a *coup d'état*, and relegated to engineering work—all proofs of the completeness of the Liberal triumph. The latest piece of French news is, however, the most important for us, and that is that the Senate has unanimously passed a bill still further suspending the obligation of the Mint to coin silver—action taken in view of what is impending in this country, and of the well-known readiness of the German Government to pour a quantity of silver, variously estimated from \$100,000,000 to \$200,000,000, into the market whenever there is any new opening. M. de Parieu, perhaps the highest authority in France on coinage questions, seized the opportunity of urging the adoption of a gold standard.

THE TERMS OF PEACE.

THE terms of peace between Russia and Turkey, though not as yet officially announced, are doubtless known with all but certainty, and they are about what it was generally expected they would be, and what the conclusions of the Conference at Constantinople satisfied most people that they ought to be. Rumania and Servia are to become independent states; and Servia is, if Austria will consent to it, to get a little more territory. Rumania is to give up to Russia the piece of Bessarabia taken from the latter by the Treaty of Paris, and is to get in return probably a piece of the Dobrudja, which would shut Turkey out completely from the mouths of the Danube. Bulgaria is to have, as the Conference proposed, "local autonomy" under a Christian governor, holding his place for a long term of years and approved by the Powers, and a similar régime will be applied to Bosnia and Herzegovina. This is called the Syrian plan, being the plan applied to Syria in 1860 on the demand of the Powers, after the massacres and brutalities of that year and the despatch of a French force to restore order, though later advices make it a much nearer approach to virtual independence. To work successfully in Bulgaria it ought to be accompanied by the evacuation of the strong places of the Quadrilateral, and, in fact, the razing of their fortifications, which can hereafter be of no use to a state in the position which Turkey will occupy, while the garrisons would be a constant menace to the peace and good order of the province. Allowing the Turks to maintain garrisons in provinces over which the Sultan had lost his complete sovereignty has been tried already, and has been found to be a source of irritation to the people, and of expense to the Ottoman Government, without in any degree disguising its real weakness. Moreover, the experience both of the Franco-German war and of this one proves that great fortresses are of no use to a power which is forced to rely on them for salvation, or, in other words, which cannot put in the field an army which can hold its own independently of the fortresses, or which needs to use them for anything but delay. In the absence of such an army they are really a help rather than a hindrance to an invader, by furnishing him with the means of capturing large bodies of his enemy without the trouble and losses of hard marching and frequent fighting. If the Russians at Plevna had been as knowing as the Germans at Metz, the occupation of the place by Gazi Osman would have made him as ridiculous as the defence of Metz made Bazaine. In other words, had they let him alone until their reserves came up and then cut the Sophia road, the world would never have heard of him except as one of the common herd of pashas; while had the Prussians battered and assaulted Metz, Bazaine would have risen rapidly into a hero of the first order. There will, therefore, be nothing unreasonable or immoderate in the Russian demand, should it be made, that the Turkish troops shall evacuate Rustchuk, Silistria, Shumla, Varna, and Widdin. Montenegro will probably get all the territory she has won from the enemy, thus relieving her of the intolerable presence of the Ottomans in the very heart of her little territory at Spitz and Niksitch, and giving her a port on the sea and access to Lake Scutari—things which her people have for many generations sighed for, and often fought for, and have by their exploits in this war alone richly earned. The Greeks at this writing appear likely to get nothing, inasmuch as they have taken no part in the fray, and there is consequently great excitement at Athens at the prospect of peace. There is something at first sight a little ridiculous in their outburst of martial ardor just when the fighting is over, but it is not so much to their discredit as it seems that they should not have taken the field before now. Their situation differs materially from that of Montenegro, Servia, and Rumania, in that their territory is very accessible to the Turkish fleet, which could ravage the islands and bombard Syra and other ports without difficulty. To be sure, a judicious application of torpedoes might have warded off this danger to a considerable degree, as the Turkish fleet is not very enterprising; but still the danger was a formidable one for so small a community, and especially one which has such a frightful remembrance

of Turkish atrocities and has lived so much of late years in politics on newspaper rhetoric.

There is not one of these changes to the approval of which the Powers are not in a great measure committed. The protocol of the Conference may fairly be said to cover them all, even if it were not supported by the Russian victories. It is only with regard to the demands of Russia on her own account that any difficulty is likely to arise, and even to these it is hard to see what objection even England can make. Indemnity for the expenses of the war is what every victor has a right to demand, and to get if she can, and there is nothing in the case of Turkey to exempt her from the operation of the general rule. There is one good reason for Russia taking territory in lieu of money, and that is that Turkey has no money, and if forced to raise it by loan or taxation it would aggravate the sufferings of the unfortunate people, Mussulman as well as Christian, who live under her rule. A slice of Armenia would, therefore, probably be considered by the civilized world as the best thing she can pay in, if she should not see fit to part with her ships, which, like the Danubian fortresses, are no longer of any use to her.

Russia has judiciously proposed to refer the question of the opening of the Dardanelles to the Powers, as it is a question which has really been under their jurisdiction ever since 1840, when the Treaty of London, of which England, Austria, Prussia, Russia, and Turkey were signatories, made the closing of the Straits to all vessels of war as the naval contribution which Turkey was to make to the common cause in case of hostilities with any other Power. As a matter of fact, previous to the completion of Sebastopol and the creation of the Black Sea fleet, it was Russia's aim to keep the Dardanelles closed. With the growth of her commerce and her territory on the Black Sea, her views have naturally changed; and it must be admitted that there is something wholly indefensible in the position that the war-vessels of a Power like her shall not be permitted to follow her trading vessels along an arm of the sea provided by nature for all comers, down into the Mediterranean, with the ports of which her commerce, already large, must every day be growing larger. Nothing can be said against it, or is said anywhere but in England, and the only argument used against it in England is that it would endanger the communication with India through the Suez Canal. But sensible Englishmen are beginning to see that if English supremacy in India can be put in peril by any naval force Russia can bring down through the Bosphorus, it is too precarious to last long under any circumstances, and—what is still more to the point—that there is no argument which will close the Bosphorus to Russia which might not be used to close the Canal to England. The complacent assertion of Sir Henry Elliot, the British ambassador at Constantinople at the time of the Bulgarian massacres, that "the necessity which existed for England to prevent changes most detrimental to themselves [ourselves] was not affected by the question whether it was 10,000 or 20,000 persons who perished in suppression" (of the Bulgarian insurrection), is one which probably no English diplomatist will ever again venture to make, and which would now be received with a smile, if not with horror, at the conference of the Powers to which Russia has herself referred the opening of the Straits. In fact, there has been nothing more absurd in modern politics than the policy of upholding a brutal despotism like Turkey in order to secure British supremacy in India, while at the same time justifying British supremacy in India on the ground that it gave the people justice and security. It bears an unpleasant resemblance to keeping a gambling-house in order to make money for a missionary society.

As a whole, the terms Russia offers may be said to be in entire accord with her promises before beginning the war, and moderate

considering the completeness of her victory. Taking everything into account, too, we think it may be fairly said that no war within the present century has rendered equal service to humanity and civilization. The others have relieved people of political oppression or gratified political aspirations; this one is likely to bring security for person and property to many millions of men who have never known it as it is known in the civilized world, and to open some of the finest regions on earth for the first time to the possibilities of modern progress. It is true that the best part of European Turkey—Rumelia—is still left in the hands of the pashas; but then its nearness to the capital and to the eye of the foreign ambassadors has long protected it against the worst abuses of Turkish rule, and will protect it now more than ever, as the pashas well know that the next time Russia takes them in hand, to Asia they will surely go. Moreover, it must be admitted that Europe is not yet ready for the Turk's total disappearance, and nobody is as yet prepared to say who should have Constantinople, or what should become of it. In twenty years more, events will probably have clearly indicated its proper destination. Either the Greeks or Slavs, or both, will by that time have made great progress, and probably have shown themselves equal to responsibilities which no one now would think of putting upon them. In other words, a successor to the Turk will probably have appeared, and when he does, the removal of the latter to Brusa will doubtless take place. Whether in Asia he will learn to live in the modern world, to accept its science and its morality, to separate in his thoughts the Koran from the sword, it is hard to say. If not, he will be gradually overwhelmed by the rise of the Christian races around him, and sink into the gloomy social decay of the Indian Mussulmans, or the harmless and innocent barbarism of the Tartars of the Crimea and Kazan.

CAN STATES BE MADE TO PAY THEIR DEBTS?

HALF the mischief to which organized communities are exposed comes from legal fictions. "The king can do no wrong" is one, "the State cannot be sued" is another and its next of kin. If any one is curious to know the exact working of the latter under our own superior system he has but to apply to the holders of bonds representing nearly three hundred millions of money that have been issued by more than half a dozen States of this Union. He will be told that the most of the securities, so-called, were put on the market by the States themselves and sold by their own agents at prices fixed by the venders, and that the money paid for them found its way into their treasuries and was disbursed according to their exclusive will and pleasure. He will be further told that none of the paper is honored by payment, some of it being openly repudiated and its redemption legally forbidden, and the rest treated with cool indifference. If he asks whether this condition of things is owing to the inability of the makers to pay their debts, he will be informed that all of them prospectively, and nearly all immediately, could, if they would, meet every dollar of their obligations. Why, then, he will naturally ask, are they not brought into court like other dishonest or delinquent debtors, and made to respond by application of the processes in such cases made and provided? The answer would be, Because the makers, negotiators, and beneficiaries of the bonds in question are "sovereign States," and as such cannot be sued.

The answer is, doubtless, quite sufficient, so far as the law of the case is concerned; but, for all that, it involves a stupendous and most unreasonable fiction. Not one of the States, except in the matter of its non-suability, is in any sense sovereign, or possessed of the attributes of an imperial power. Not one of them can declare or make war on its own responsibility, enter into a treaty or alliance offensive or defensive, send or receive an accredited ambassador, levy an impost duty, coin money, grant letters of marque or reprisal, emit bills of credit, pass a bill of attainder, or create a title of nobility—all indispensable prerogatives of a sovereign. The only truly royal privilege of which it is possessed is to run head over ears

in debt, and then snap its fingers in the faces of its innocent and confiding creditors when pay-day comes.

Nowhere in the Federal Constitution are the States recognized as sovereign. Indeed, the word "sovereign" does not occur in that instrument—an omission the more noteworthy in view of the fact that the Articles of Confederation, to which it succeeded, in speaking of the States, positively stipulated that each "retained its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right which was not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled." That the word "sovereignty" was purposely dropped is logically apparent. The framers of the Constitution knew perfectly well that while there could be a confederation made up of sovereign States, there could be no nation thus compounded, and it was a nation they were constructing—a nation that was to have one head and many members.

The States, it is true, have certain powers which sovereigns exercise—legislative, judicial, and executive; but so have corporations like the city of New York, which no one pretends to be sovereign. The word "corporation," beyond all question, most fitly and clearly defines their functions. A corporation is a body legally created and deriving its authority from a superior power; and how else have the majority of the States of this Union come into existence? They have been created by law, and brought into the family of States by the pleasure of the paternal Government, instead of coming into it by treaty or mutual agreement. And those States which were originally independent, by consenting to stand on an equality with those afterward to be organized in the manner stated, consented to occupy a like subordinate station. That a corporation cannot be sued will not be contended for on any principle.

And even the one sovereign attribute of non-suability was not intended by the authors of the Constitution to be enjoyed by the States. They expressly provided in Section 2, Article III., of that instrument that the jurisdiction of the Federal courts should extend to "controversies between two or more States, between a State and citizens of another State, between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States, and between a State, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens, or subjects." That language the Supreme Court of the United States, in 1792, in the case of *Chisholm v. Georgia*, reported in 2 Dallas, held to include a State not only as a party plaintiff in a civil action but, in a proper case, as a defendant in a suit brought by a private individual for the enforcement of a moneyed demand, thus utterly rejecting the old doctrine that a State could not be sued. This conclusion was deduced both from the wording of the Constitution and the requirements of common sense and natural justice. Said Chief-Justice Jay, in delivering the opinion of the court, after referring to the fact that one of the declared purposes of the Constitution was to "establish justice," the construction that would enable a State to sue, but exempt it from being sued, "would contradict and do violence to the great and leading principles of a free and equal national Government, one of the great objects of which is to insure justice to all—to the few against the many, as well as to the many against the few. It would be strange, indeed, that the joint and equal sovereigns of this country should, in the very Constitution by which they professed to 'establish justice,' so far deviate from the plain path of equality and impartiality as to give to the collective citizens of one State a right of suing individual citizens of another State, and yet deny to those citizens a right of suing them." It is a bad rule, naively remarks the Chief-Justice, that does not work both ways; and what is a bad rule of morals cannot be good law.

In the same case Associate Justice Wilson, in a corroborative opinion, gives utterance to the following sentiment:

"A State, like a merchant, makes a contract; a dishonest State, like a dishonest merchant, wilfully refuses to discharge it. The latter is amenable to a court of justice; upon what principle of right shall the former, when summoned to answer the fair demands of its creditor, be permitted, Proteus-like, to assume a new appearance, and to insult him and justice by declaring, 'I am a sovereign State'? Assuredly it should not."

It will thus be seen that, whatever may have been considered by the framers of the Constitution as the reserved rights of the States, the privilege of turning their backs upon their honest creditors, and refusing them fair redress, was not among them. The authors of that document intended to give no countenance to repudiation. Had the Constitution been permitted to stand as it was originally adopted, the non-resident holders of the dishonored paper of Minnesota, Georgia, Tennessee, etc., could now go into the Federal Courts and prosecute their claims to judgment and collection in the same way that any other delinquent debtor can be proceeded against. In that case it would not be unreasonable to assume that the credit of some of our States would to-day rate considerably higher in the market.

But among the first Amendments to the Constitution, adopted in 1794, was the following, known as the Eleventh in order:

"The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state."

A State can now go into a Federal court and sue a citizen of another State or country, but the same citizen cannot enter the same court and sue the State, no matter how large his demand or how equitable his case. The rule now works but one way. Justice, as between individuals and States, is entirely a jug-handled affair. A more unfair discrimination was never created by law. The reason for engrafting such an inconsistency upon a code that professed to "establish justice" among men and communities was the embarrassed condition of the States at the time the Federal Union was formed. Every one of them was threatened by suits for large demands of shadowy merit, prosecuted for damages to person, or for the value of property appropriated by the State's representatives during the war of the Revolution. It was the apprehension of these war-claims that carried the amendment making the States unsuable by individual claimants. It was not the first instance in which, to escape a present and temporary evil, a lasting injury was done, and in which the remedy was infinitely worse than the disease. The possibility of the States abusing the immunity extended to them was, of course, suggested while the amendment was under discussion, but so exalted was the idea then entertained of State honor that the contingency of a State deliberately refusing to pay its just debts was hardly thought worth considering. Since that date public opinion has undergone a great change on that point.

The remedy for the evil pointed out is so obvious that it hardly needs to be mentioned. It is to repeal the Eleventh Amendment, by the same process that brought about its enactment, and thus restore the Constitution to its original integrity. The reason for the Amendment long ago ceased to exist, and the provision remains a blot upon an otherwise beneficent code, an instrument of far-reaching fraud. There is no principle upon which it can longer be defended. Think of the great city of New York being suable by the citizen to whom it may owe ten dollars, while commonwealths like Delaware and Nevada, with less than one-tenth the population or wealth, may owe the same person millions of dollars, and if not honest enough to pay voluntarily, the courts of the country can afford him no relief. It is difficult to see how such incongruity could be seriously maintained by even the most ardent stickler for State rights. The Eleventh Amendment out of the way, most of the bondholders of repudiating or delinquent States could go into the Federal courts and have their demands fairly considered. If a valid defence existed it could be set up. No wrong would be done to the States. If the demands were found to be just and legal, judgment would be rendered accordingly, and the creditor would be entitled to a *mandamus* to compel the State authorities to levy and collect the tax necessary to satisfy the debt.

What valid objection could be urged? Surely the States that have not had their names entered upon the rôle of repudiators, but which share in the common disgrace and loss of credit occasioned by the dishonest courses of their fellows—and which, fortunately, yet number more than the three-fourths necessary to ratify a change

in the Constitution—would be only too glad of the opportunity to do an act of justice and vindicate the nation's honor. Good citizens of all the States would favor the movement on general principles. And few, we take it, could be found at this day so wedded to the idea of State sovereignty as to oppose a measure conceded to be honorable and just, out of deference to a fiction that has done so much to cover the land with blood and is now doing so much to cover it with disgrace.

VICTOR EMMANUEL.

ROME, January 10, 1878.

KING VICTOR EMMANUEL is no more, and with him a momentous piece of history and of legend is gone. The Italy we saw come into being and grow remains, but it is no longer the same Italy which, through good and bad fortune, was wedded to the sturdy soldier who has so unexpectedly left his kingdom.

Victor Emmanuel had gone towards the close of the year to Turin, where his wife, Countess Mirafiori, lay dangerously ill. He stayed there longer than he originally intended, owing to the exceptional gravity of the case. His royal duties, however, called him here for the receptions of New Year's day, and the state dinners which usually accompany and follow them. He intended, however, to leave again for Turin on Monday the 7th, after having presided on the previous day at the so-called diplomatic dinner, when the violent outburst of his illness prevented him from both—his son, Crown-Prince (now King) Humbert, being obliged to take the head of the table. Already on Saturday evening the King did not feel quite well, and in the night the heat and the want of breath had become so intolerable that he committed the imprudence of opening the window towards the gardens of the Quirinal and walking on the balcony in the damp night air, in order to get some relief; for which he paid dearly. The next morning he lay in violent fever; an inflammation of the right lung declared itself, and it was unfortunately complicated with a so-called *perniciosa*—i.e., the fever resulting from the Roman malaria. The evil increased steadily during Sunday and Monday; and the doctor who nine years ago cured his Majesty of the same illness, which had befallen him then at his shooting-place of San Rossore, near Pisa, was summoned, together with the two first medical authorities of Italy, Prof. Cipriani, of Florence, and Prof. Bruno, of Turin. For nearly two days the King was scarcely conscious, in consequence of which the bystanders were prevented from calling in the Crown-Prince and Crown-Princess, the extremely rigid Savoyard court-etiquette not permitting the son to appear before his father without his express summons. The day before yesterday, however, the King recovered his senses, and the first wish he expressed was for his children. Prince Humbert and Princess Margherita scarcely left his room afterwards until his death, which took place yesterday, Wednesday, at half-past three. His other children, Queen Pia of Portugal; Princess Clotilde Bonaparte, Prince Jerome Napoleon's wife; and the Duke of Aosta, once King Amadeo of Spain, were called by telegraph; but only the latter and his uncle, Prince Carignan, arrived last night—even they too late. During the thirty-six hours preceding his end the King was fully conscious, and saw clearly his fate. He encouraged his son and daughter-in-law, conversed at some length with two of the ministers—the President of the Council, Sig. Depretis, being himself detained by illness—and especially with General Medici, his aide-de-camp. Repeatedly he recommended to his son and successor "Italy and Liberty" as the two immutable stars which ought to guide him in his political conduct. He asked, himself, for the consolations of religion. Already on Tuesday evening Mgr. Marinelli had been sent by the Pope, who received throughout the illness hourly bulletins of the King's state, to take off the interdiction from the Quirinal, an interdiction which, as everybody remembers, the Holy Father had pronounced when in 1870 his palace had been broken open and prepared for the King's residence. Yesterday, Wednesday, at twelve, Victor Emmanuel confessed himself and received the sacrament from the hands of his confessor, Padre Anzino; and two hours later the chief chaplain of the court gave him the extreme unction, after which the King felt better, it appeared. A newly-invented apparatus to bring oxygen to the lungs relieved him in part, but only for a few moments. Once more he asked after his absent children, pressed Prince Humbert's hand, and with the cry, "The children, the children" (*i figli, i figli*), he expired at half-past two. Almost at the same moment, too late, however, arrived a high prelate from the Vatican, bringing the special blessing of the Holy Father.

The news spread instantaneously among the thronged multitude which

covered the square before the Quirinal and the Consulta round Phidias's horses, and like an electric stroke went through the Eternal City. The grief is general and intense. Even the Republicans, who lately have so audaciously lifted their heads; even the clericals, who for some time past have been meditating a reappearance on the political battle-field, show consternation. It is as if the youth and the poetry of the national life were finished; and as every Italian, to whatever party he may belong, is always Italian before he is a Catholic or a Republican, all feel deeply the loss of the man who embodied Italy; who, by his daring as well as by his prudence, by his moderation and his statesman's eye, had succeeded in making out of a "geographical term" a great and living national organism. Everybody feels what the nation owes him, and that but for him Italy would never have existed, however great Cavour's genius, Garibaldi's heroism, the people's patriotism. He was at once the bold and the cold-blooded player, who staked his all on the card of Italian unity and who won the prize, not for himself alone but for the whole country. Like every true monarch whose family has been for hundreds, nay, for a thousand years identified with the weal and woe of an important commonwealth, he had the rare instinct of what his country's honor and interest demanded, because it was his own individual honor and interest. People must not believe that King Victor Emmanuel, because he was a constitutional monarch, had little or no influence upon the politics of his country. True, he was never mixed up in the party squabbles, nor even in the small questions of daily policy; but it was he who chose Cavour and maintained him against court influences and unpopularity; he who gave La Marmora *carte blanche* to reform the old, glorious, and well-trying Sardinian army; he who gave his consent that Garibaldi should enter Naples; he who decided the taking of Rome in 1870, in spite of his strong religious feelings and his personal attachment to Pius IX.; he who in March, 1876, declared the time come to try a ministry of the Left, instead of changing once more the beaten Cabinet for another shade of the same color, as had been done for seventeen years.

Prince Humbert was immediately proclaimed King, and has declared, as early as last evening, that he maintains the present Cabinet, which, whilst I am writing, is assembled at the Consulta in order to prepare the manifesto to the nation. Everybody knows how popular the graceful and intelligent Princess, now Queen, Margherita is with all classes and all parties. The new King is generally less known, and a somewhat stormy youth has created many prejudices against him, which are hardly justified. I have had the honor of talking at length with him several times, without witnesses, and I found in him a man of very sound judgment, fully informed of the state of Europe and of that of his own country, perfectly versed in contemporary as well as former history. Already for the last four or five years he has taken a serious interest in politics, and he seems to have the hereditary quickness of his family in judging men and in finding out what he has to say to each and every one. It stands to reason that King Humbert cannot enjoy the prestige of his father, who took up his crown on the battlefield of Novara, defended the constitution against his evil councillors from within and without; who cast his lot with his Sardinian people in 1855, with entire Italy in 1859 and 1860; who fought for Venice in 1866, and entered Rome in 1870. But the tie which unites Italy to King Humbert is none the weaker because it is one of interest and calculation more than of sympathy and love; and there is good ground to hope that many years will not have elapsed before the *mariage de raison* between Italy and her new King will become a marriage of sincere affection. King Humbert has a difficult task before him, no doubt. It is probable that he will find himself soon before one of the most momentous questions of our time. Pius IX. cannot long survive his royal rival; with his end the religious question will awake more dangerous than ever. The very advances made by the Vatican towards the Quirinal, on occasion of Victor Emmanuel's illness and death, are full of ominous significance for one who knows how things lie. Father Curci, *l'enfant terrible* of the Curia, has prematurely betrayed the word of the Catholic conspiracy; let us hope that King Humbert will beware and remain as watchful as his father, who always knew how to separate his personal feelings from his duties toward the state. As for the emergencies of the Eastern Question, we can say that the cape is doubled, and King Humbert, who has never concealed his sympathies for Germany, will not choose this moment to part from the Three Emperors' league, to which his father himself, in spite of his western tendencies, acceded a few months before his death. As for the inner affairs of Italy, the King can do little for good or for evil to change them; it is the nation's own business to disentangle itself. One thing is certain, that as long as there is a tolerably energetic and watchful Government

nothing is to be dreaded from Republicanism, however audacious and fanatical its partisans may be; nay, they are so few in number that I do not even think the present Cabinet, in spite of its intellectual mediocrity, its moral weakness, its scanty authority, too feeble to resist their eventual enterprises, which, I firmly believe, they are themselves far too prudent to risk for some time to come.

THE OLD MASTERS AT BURLINGTON HOUSE.

[FROM AN OCCASIONAL CORRESPONDENT.]

LONDON, January 12, 1878.

IN speaking, a year ago, of the loan exhibition which now regularly takes place in the rooms of the Royal Academy during the months preceding the great show of the pictures of the year, I had occasion to say that the very rich stock of art-treasures from which these assemblages are drawn shows as yet no sign of being exhausted. In the light of the exhibition of the present year this remark needs, perhaps, to be slightly modified. The stock is doubtless not nearly exhausted, but the milk-pail, if I may be allowed in such a connection so vulgar an expression, has been pretty well skimmed. The first-rate things scattered among private collections over the length and breadth of this most richly-furnished country have, for the most part, taken their glorious turn upon the winter-lighted walls of Burlington House. There are, doubtless, some great prizes remaining, but they are not very numerous. The Titians, Rubenses, Rembrandts, Vandykes, the precious specimens of the Dutch painters, the flower of the Reynoldses and Gainsboroughs, have already obeyed the invitation. This year there are two or three superb Rembrandts; but it is apparent that for the future (unless they begin at the top of the list again) the exhibitions must be pitched in a minor key. To-day, in the absence of great Italians, we have a room devoted to the "Norwich School." I do not mention this fact invidiously, for the Norwich picture is very interesting. I allude to it simply to indicate that London picture-lovers must begin and clip a little the wings of expectation. It has been the custom with these exhibitions to have, on each successive year, a specialty—the ear-mark of the particular exhibition. At first this distinguishing stamp was given by the greater masters; there was the Titian year, the Rubens year, the year when the early Tuscan painters came out with peculiar force. Then there was the Reynolds year, and the Gainsborough year; and there was even, a twelvemonth since, what it would be tolerably correct to call the Raeburn year. At the present moment, I suppose, one may talk of the Norwich year. The works of the painters who achieved the unique distinction of reflecting their eminence upon an English provincial town three-quarters of a century ago are ranged together in the first room; and although there are names in the exhibition much more familiarly known to fame than those of John Crome, Cotman, Stannard, Vincent, Stark, there is no part of it more interesting than that occupied by this modest but exquisite group. The founder of the so-called Norwich School was John Crome—"Old Crome"—a man of genius who, among manifold difficulties, spent the greater part of his life cultivating landscape art in the neighborhood of a little English episcopal city, at what would be termed to-day—at least from the artistic and even the landscape point of view—a very Philistine period of its history. He gathered about him a number of not unworthy pupils, appreciative observers of humble scenery, who, under his wholesome influence and with the minimum of patronage, succeeded in founding the sole local subdivision in the history of English painting. John Crome is a very charming painter, and each of his companions has an interest of his own; but to a stranger, I think, almost the chief merit of the group will be historic or social—found in the simple fact that it held its own and flourished in a situation in which there can have been the least possible human inspiration towards taking the pictorial view of things. It is hard to imagine an assemblage of painters, united by a common ideal, holding well together in an English cathedral town even at this emancipated and Ruskinized day; but to reflect that something of that kind happened during those dusky years of the Napoleonic wars, when England was shut up to her purely British and unæsthetic self, is to find one's self confronted with a genuine marvel. There are no less than twenty-seven of Old Crome's landscapes in the exhibition (I do not know how he came to gain his sobriquet; he lived but to the moderate age of fifty-two), and most of them are extremely delightful. With two exceptions (rather infelicitous memorials of a journey to Paris), they are illustrations of the homely Norfolk scenery—the moist meadows and brown-coated moors, the canal-like rivers, the thatched and gabled cottages, the shallow harbors of the region in which he was born. He

had evidently had some observation of the Dutch masters of landscape, and he had zealously appropriated their teachings. There is a certain "View on the Wensum," a small expanse of stagnant-looking river, shut in by brick-walled houses with pointed roofs, which would require very little more perfection of detail to make it pass for a Van der Heyden. Crome is seen at his best, however, in the rendering of open spaces—of heath and furze and scrubby trees, and morning and evening skies. Near the picture just named hangs an admirable "Distant View of Norwich," taken in the late afternoon, with the mass of the city lying large and vague in the early dusk, and the spire of the cathedral—a loved landmark—rising far into a sky of remarkable mellowness and airiness. There are also two other little pictures—a certain view of "St. Martin's Gate" and another on "The Back River"—of old steep-roofed, ruddy-walled houses, reflected in thick, quiet water that are full of a Dutch minuteness and reality. The perfect Dutch skill and taste are wanting; but there is a great charm of coloring, and most of the pictures, like those of the Dutch masters, have suffered very gratefully the action of time. They have a sort of rich brown bloom—a sober glow. I have not space to speak in detail of Crome's followers; but I must spare an allusion to James Stark, who in a small way, with his thin woods, his crooked roads, his timbered cottages, his grey skies, and his unambitious love of foliage, reminds one even vividly of Hobbema. Stark is very charming, though doubtless a little finical and common. Cotman is also charming, with the advantage of being stronger and more breezy; a fine Cotman, indeed—for instance, a certain "Windmill," in this same room, with a great watery, wind-stirred sky—is a very noble piece of work.

In the way of landscape the exhibition contains three or four other excellent things. One of the two Turners—a "Trout Stream," lent by Lord Essex—may be so spoken of, in virtue of its superb rendering of a gigantic grey cloud lifted up into the air and returning upon itself, like a waterspout. Of the unequalled art with which, in a subject like this, Turner contrasted with his pregnant vapor-masses the lighted spaces of the sky, this picture is a sufficient illustration. In connection with Cotman's "Windmill," I should mention a picture by Rembrandt bearing the same title; or rather, I may say, it will be more considerate of the English painter to mention it apart. The Rembrandt, which is one of the artist's strongest landscapes and is the property of the fortunate Lord Lansdowne, represents a mill standing almost in profile upon a low cliff that overlooks a river. The picture is very dark, and in the way in which the stunted tower of the mill stands up against the sky, and its clumsy arms spread themselves in the faded, ruddy evening light, while the lower part of the subject is bathed in the usual brown Rembrandt-esque mystery, there is an ample suggestion of the painter's characteristic magic. A picture that need not fear juxtaposition even with Rembrandt is an admirable specimen of a Dutch painter who is rarely encountered—John de Capella: a grey, moist harbor-scene; the edge of a pier near which a boat is unloading, and an expanse of quiet water, with other boats vaguely seen beyond it. This small picture is a masterpiece; the look of the monotonous sky, stuffed, as it were, with small rain-clouds; of the warm, damp air, with softened, muffled sounds passing through it, is a marvel of quiet skill. There are two or three good specimens of the better-known Dutch landscape painters—a couple of interesting Jacob Ruysdaels and of desirable Hobbemas. In relation to Rembrandt, I must speak of certain portraits from his great hand, which are presumably to be accounted the gems of the exhibition. One is a superb portrait of himself as a young man—painted in 1635; the other a head of a Jewish rabbi, which is present at Burlington House in two editions. One of these latter works has been contributed by the Duke of Devonshire, the other by Lord Powercourt, and the second being an inferior replica—or a picture, at the best, much injured by time, or possibly by cleaning—the presence of its competitor may, in vulgar parlance, be pronounced "rough on" the Duke of Devonshire's fellow-peer. The portrait is in Rembrandt's greatest manner, and represents an old man with a much-twisted turban, an upper lip shaven like that of an American legislator, a large, ugly face, magnificently wrinkled and withered, and a big jewelled clasp glowing upon the bosom of his furred and dusky robe. The picture is full of that profundity of life which we find in Rembrandt's greatest works. There are naturally many other portraits; but with the exception of a beautiful head of a gentleman, auburn-haired and refined, by Rubens, there is nothing of absolutely the first importance. The Titians are, I should say, apocryphal, and the Vandykes, though decidedly striking, not of supreme excellence. The same may be said of the Gainsboroughs and Sir Joshuas, which are, as

usual, abundant. The exhibition, with regard to Gainsborough, is chiefly but a reminder of the difference existing between good and indifferent specimens of this too prolific painter. Still, one takes a pleasure even in a collection of fairish Gainsboroughs, by reason of the large proportion of charming faces among his models. He painted some very weak pictures, but he never fairly sacrificed a face. There are two interesting Romney's—portraits of his perpetual model, Lady Hamilton, which, though the painting is of an almost primitive baldness, are highly suggestive of the lady's extraordinary, innocent-looking loveliness. She had evidently a genius for "sitting." There are many more interesting things which I have no space to commemorate, and I must content myself with a mere allusion to the brilliant winter-exhibition of the Grosvenor Gallery. This is composed of drawings and water-colors by masters not living, and in the department of drawings is especially strong. The Queen has lent a great many from the treasures of Windsor, most of which are of high value. But supreme among them and easily surpassing everything else—even two or three noble designs of Michael Angelo and several beautiful sketches of Raphael—are a series of deeply-interesting heads by Leonardo da Vinci. These things, as drawings, strike me, in their union of the grand and the exquisite, of intellectual intention with brilliant handiwork, as beyond price.

Correspondence.

THE WOODRUFF EXPEDITION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The severe criticism on the Woodruff scientific expedition in your No. 654 (Jan. 10) leaves untouched one point which it is an act of simple benevolence to bring to the attention of every parent who may contemplate patronizing it. Knowing, as I do, a little of the demoralizing influences to which the young are subject on such a voyage, I have no hesitation in saying that no considerate parent would allow a son to enter upon it except from a profound ignorance of the danger to character and morals thus incurred. If further light is wanted, I would refer all enquirers to the nearest naval officer of age and experience, preference being given to one who has visited foreign ports on a school or training-ship.

NAVY.

WASHINGTON, January 26, 1878.

COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN ORATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In an article entitled "Collegiate Oratory," which appeared in the *Nation* for Jan. 17, 1878, you say: "Far from cultivating this [the art of debate], however, one of the noblest and manliest of arts, our colleges, in so far as they have given any attention to the matter at all, have devoted themselves to encouraging the 'demonstrative oratory' of the Greeks. . . . It was a curious and significant circumstance that not one of the subjects chosen by the young men who declaimed the other night at the Academy of Music, except one, had the smallest connection with the topics now agitating the world—the problems of trade, finance, religion, and war"; and the article implied that the tendency of college instruction is to produce a set of "hazy" thinkers.

At Harvard, where "demonstrative oratory" is unknown, the subjects given out for themes, forensics, and theses have a direct bearing on the questions of the day. In themes the subjects are taken mainly from college life; and because such subjects may be treated exhaustively in a limited space, the student is, in this way, restrained from "hazy" thinking. Moreover, since subjects of the class referred to bear the same relation to college life that the editorials of a "daily" bear to the life of the world at large, the student, on graduating, finds himself confronted with questions differing from those he has been accustomed to not in kind but in degree. In addition to the required work, there is this year a new elective, in which the end of the instruction is, to use your own words, "to train the student carefully in the mastery of subjects and the arrangement of arguments."

In forensics, where the only thing considered is the merit of the composition in respect to its logical arrangement, the subjects have embraced such practical questions as the benefit of foreign commerce, the repeal of usury laws, and the transmission of property.

In many of the courses theses on special subjects are given out; especially is this the case in the advanced course in political economy, in which the subjects for the year include "Reciprocity with Canada,"

"The True Ground of Taxation," and "Whether Should the Government or the Banks Issue the Currency?" In the first course in political economy much time is devoted to the study of the financial history of the United States, and the English money market as explained in the pages of 'Lombard Street'—both practical subjects certainly.

Elocution plays a minor part. Those students who wish instruction meet the professor once a week for a private lesson of twenty minutes' duration. The training of the voice and the elements of gesticulation are all that is taught. Certainly Harvard can get along with no less elocutionary training and at the same time have any regard for the Commencement audiences.

SENIOR.

HARVARD COLLEGE, Jan. 22, 1878.

THE DECORATION OF TRINITY CHURCH, BOSTON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I notice in Mr. Clarence Cook's article on "Recent Church Decoration," in the current number of *Scribner's*, some statements in regard to the painting of the Boston Trinity Church which seem to need explanation, if not correction.

He says that one is "disappointed to find how small a part Mr. La Farge's individual work plays in the interior of the church," probably meaning that the pictures form a rather small proportion of the surface, but giving the impression that only a portion of the whole system of decoration is due to Mr. La Farge, and the rest to some one else; and it so happens that immediately afterwards come some remarks about the kindness of Fortune in sending to him, "all unpractised in the technics of wall-painting, such a right-hand helper as Mr. Daniel Cottier." The hasty reader might be excused for putting the two things together, and inferring from them and some sentences which follow that Mr. Cottier was in some way the author of at least a part of the decoration of the building, the credit of which has hitherto gone to Mr. La Farge.

As Mr. Cottier would no more wish to share other people's honors through a mistake than Mr. La Farge would like to be described as one who appropriated a brother-artist's labors without acknowledgment, it should be known that Mr. Cottier's actual connection with the work did not extend much beyond the supplying of workmen, who may have been, as Mr. Cook says, more skilful than others in mixing and applying colors. Instead of his having anything to do with the planning of the scheme of decoration, the coloring and design of the tower and the design of the roof and nave walls were all on paper long before Mr. Cottier was consulted, and, if I am not mistaken, while he was in Europe, and those drawings were carried out as nearly as a sketch at a small scale could be applied to the actual wall.

It was not till after a contract had been made with other parties, and the painting of some of the walls finished, that Mr. La Farge decided to terminate the first contract and make arrangements with Mr. Cottier to supply workmen. They had several consultations, and, no doubt, Mr. Cottier's advice was very useful; but as Mr. La Farge's plans were already fixed, and were not afterwards changed, it must have been, as Mr. Cook suggests, for the most part general advice about processes and mediums, which would apply to any building. Of course, he would have been very kind in helping in the design and coloring, if that had not been already fixed; and in decorating the ceiling of the tower, which had not been shown on the drawings, a proposition of his was once partly carried into effect, but it was afterwards painted over quite differently. Except this and another suggestion of his about the color of the woodwork, which was adopted, I cannot think of any point in which he influenced the design.

Mr. Cook seems himself to be a little astray as to the nature of Mr. Cottier's services, useful as they may have been to Mr. La Farge, when he says: "When all the panels, spandrels, etc., shall have been filled with pictures the obligation to Mr. Cottier will be more evident than it is now." This is rather a mysterious assertion at the best, and is still more difficult to understand when we consider that there is not a square inch of wall in the church which has on it anything that Mr. Cottier designed or any color which he selected.

To Mr. Lathrop is certainly due, as Mr. Cook says, the design for the roof, besides the band around the apse, and many other portions of the work, and various other gentlemen took part in designing the innumerable details; but every design was made and every color placed subject to Mr. La Farge's direction and approval, if not by his own hands, and the decoration as much belongs to him as "Hamlet" does to Shakspeare, in spite of the assignment of the parts to different actors to interpret.

Mr. La Farge must be flattered at the number of persons whose friends would like to have them share his laurels. It seemed as if he was pretty liberal of them in writing eight other names beside his own in the modest inscription by which he signed his work. But that does not seem to have satisfied all the aspirants. I remember a party coming into the church one day, while the decoration was in progress, and enquiring for "the artist." "Was it Mr. La Farge they wished to see?" "No." "Mr. Lathrop?" "No." Mr. Millet and Mr. Maynard did not seem to meet the case, and it turned out that the one they wanted was the Scotch foreman who mixed the paint and applied the stencils. It seemed that he passed in some outside circles for the real artist, and very possibly he was capable of great things if he had been called upon for them; but, in point of fact, his canny device for handing his name down to posterity by painting it in large letters among the stencillings of the roof was the only original thought that the church owes to him.

Some answer might be given to portions of the criticism made without knowing all the circumstances; but Mr. La Farge can afford to bear a little unjust blame if he is sure of all the credit which belongs to him, and Mr. Cook's candid opinions are so valuable that it would be a pity to annoy him by unnecessary captiousness.

T. M. CLARK.

60 DEVONSHIRE ST., BOSTON.

THE FREEDMAN'S HOSPITAL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Having been for years a subscriber to your paper, and disposed to accord with its general views in political matters, I have been accustomed to give it credit for meaning well, and for taking pains to gain correct information before making positive affirmations. But your paragraph in this week's issue, relative to the Freedman's Hospital in this city, is so wide of the facts that it shakes my faith in the last respect named. The trustees of Howard University are interested in the matter of the removal of Dr. Palmer (which, contrary to your statement, has not occurred) because he has been for several years the Dean of their Medical Faculty, rendering gratuitous services and giving the students under him access to the hospital.

They have represented to the President and to Secretary Schurz that they had no opposition to make to his removal for sufficient cause, but wished that no mistake should be made on the merits of the case, lest their interests should incidentally suffer, as well as injustice be done to Dr. Palmer. They therefore drew the attention of the Secretary to the fact that his own commission had fully exonerated Dr. Palmer, after spending a month in a careful examination of the case: that the reading of the condensed written testimony by himself and his solicitor, without having seen or heard the witnesses at the time, only half qualified him to judge of the case; that the unreported evidence (on which in part the commission had relied) consisted of their personal examination of the hospital and conversation with patients, and of their judgment of the manner, spirit, and character of the unfavorable witnesses, which, as is alleged, proved to be of the worst description, as was admitted by the Secretary; that Dr. Palmer would willingly submit to a new and most searching investigation by a committee of Congress, or of army surgeons named by the President; and that, as great interests were at stake and Dr. Palmer's reputation was unspotted, care should be had to be sure of all the facts before final action was taken.

Secretary Schurz, in the presence of the trustees, declared to the President that he charged nothing against Dr. Palmer's moral integrity, but that it was simply a question of efficient management, and that the case was not yet closed, but Dr. Palmer was to be allowed to put in further written evidence. The President, at the end of the interview, said that he was very friendly to Howard University, and would do all that he could to promote its interests; that he would see that Dr. Palmer was retained, if that were wise; and that, in case of his removal, he would see that his successor should be a man who would co-operate with the university.

No decision has yet been reached.

Dr. Palmer has since submitted to the Secretary over sixty new depositions contradicting the charges made, and it is hoped that the mind of the Secretary will be relieved. Meanwhile the Senate has ordered its Committee on Appropriations to investigate the subject, which is precisely what the friends of Dr. Palmer desire, and they calmly await the revelation of the truth.

As you seem to have been misled by insufficient information, I trust that you will insert this statement in your next issue.

Yours truly, WM. W. PATTON,
President of Howard University.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 25, 1878.

[We are sorry if we have done injustice either to Dr. Palmer or Dr. Patton. Our paragraph was based on the report of the *New York Times*, which was very circumstantial and which we had every reason to believe to be correct. Meanwhile, we are able to say positively that the new depositions do not mend the matter; that the oral testimony of the witnesses, as since taken by Mr. Schurz himself, differs materially from the affidavits; and that all examined before him, except one, have disclaimed the affidavits.—ED. NATION.]

Notes.

THE unusual proceeding of giving the purchasers of the first edition of a book the benefit of the revisions and additions in the second edition has been resorted to by Mr. Henry Sidgwick, in his 'Supplement to the First Edition of the *Methods of Ethics*' (New York: Macmillan & Co.) This is a pamphlet of 123 pages, uniform with the original work.—We are not among those who would recommend Trench's 'Study of Words' as a text-book; but for such as think it ought to be so employed an edition has been specially prepared by Thomas D. Supplée, of St. Augustine's College, Cal., and published in this city by W. J. Widdleton.—We are glad to see that the *Tribune Index* is to appear as regularly as the *Tribune Almanac*, and that its usefulness in the office of that paper ensures its continuance apart from any general demand for it. The *Index* for 1877 fills 116 pages, and should be indispensable to every well-regulated newspaper office. Of the *Almanac* for 1878 we need not speak. Some typographical errors that we have happened upon in using it are not surprising among so many dates and figures.—Estes & Lauriat have just issued Daudet's 'Nabab' in an English dress. Our Paris correspondent has already, in No. 653 of the *Nation*, done justice to this latest product of contemporary historical fiction.—A. S. Barnes & Co. will publish immediately 'The Commonwealth Reconstructed,' by C. C. P. Clark, a writer of no little force and originality.—The *Radical Review* enters upon its second volume as a bi-monthly.—The first number of the *American Journal of Mathematics*, to be published early next month, will contain articles by Profs. Sylvester and Newcomb, Mr. Charles S. Peirce, and others, including two writers from abroad.—According to Mr. Spofford's last report, the Library of Congress numbers upwards of 330,000 volumes, of which more than one-fifth are piled upon the floor. The neglect of this magnificent collection by Congress is as surprising as it is discreditable. The general catalogue is being printed; work has been resumed on the index to Congressional documents, debates, etc.; the third volume of original historical documents relating to French discoveries in the Northwest is nearly completed; and instead of reprinting the imperfect printed journals of the Continental Congress and the Congress of the Confederation, Mr. Spofford proposes to reproduce the MS. journals in the custody of the State Department.—Among recent German publications we find noteworthy R. Lepsius's 'Babylonian-Assyrian Measures of Length according to the Table of Senkereh'; volume one of H. Merguet's 'Lexicon to Cicero's Orations,' citing all passages; volume three of F. Ritschl's 'Opuscula Philologica,' "ad literas Latinas spectantia"; volume two of A. Vanicek's 'Græco-Latin Etymological Dictionary'; and H. Welzhofer's 'Thucydides and his History,' a contribution to the history of historiography. The third part of Von Holtzendorff's 'Handbuch des deutschen Strafprozessrechts' relates to the Penal Procedure regulation of Feb. 1, 1877.

—The vexed question as to whether Columbia College is to remain a city college or remove to the suburbs is in fair course of solution, and an early decision on the part of the trustees is expected. They have for several years been accumulating their surplus revenue as a building-fund for the erection of the new buildings as soon as a site should be definitely chosen. Unfortunately, the necessities of this fund have compelled the trustees to decline purchasing the library of the late George T. Strong in spite of the very favorable terms on which it was offered. A movement was at once started among the alumni to buy it and give it to the college. Mr. Evert A. Duyckinck, one of the library committee of the

trustees, has carefully examined the Strong collection and strenuously advises its purchase. It would combine with the present college library to great advantage, as only 304 duplicates would result from the fusion. Its specialties are books on the fine arts and early American history, German literature and MSS., forty-eight in number, which Mr. Duyckinck reports "consist of Bibles, missals, books of hours, and Greek and Latin authors, representing every century from the twelfth to the seventeenth, and are richly decorated by the art of the illuminator." The library also includes books formerly belonging to Charles Lamb and containing MS. notes by Coleridge. It is offered to the alumni for \$15,000, or less than half its estimated value if dispersed, and a fifth of the amount has already been subscribed, in part by individual trustees. The secretary of the special committee appointed by the Alumni Association is Mr. Henry R. Beckman, 55 Pine Street.

—The State Geological Survey of Wisconsin, begun under the late Dr. J. A. Lapham in 1873, has recently issued the first volume (vol. ii.) of its final report, 768 pp. royal octavo, illustrated by wood-cuts, several full-page lithographs, and maps in the text, and accompanied by an atlas of sixteen very large colored maps. The volume contains: 1. The Annual Reports of Dr. Lapham for 1873 and 1874 to the Legislature, and that of Dr. O. W. Wight for 1875. 2. The Report of Prof. T. C. Chamberlin, the present director, on the Geology of Eastern Wisconsin. 3. The Report of Prof. R. D. Irving on the Geology of Central Wisconsin. 4. The Report of Moses Strong on the Geology and Topography of the Lead Region. The work of these several gentlemen has evidently been done with skill and care, and the results are more concisely and systematically arranged than is usual in such reports. Among the new and interesting facts brought out are those with regard to the glacial drift, which reaches a remarkable development in northern and eastern Wisconsin, and is rendered the more striking by the entire absence of drift, and of all signs of glaciation over 12,000 square miles of the southwestern part of the State. The evidence presented by Prof. Chamberlin appears to show conclusively the former existence of a great glacier in the valley now occupied by Green Bay and Lake Winnebago, and another larger one in the Lake Michigan depression. The origin of the driftless region is for the first time successfully discussed by Prof. Irving, who shows that it owes its existence not to superior altitudes, as has heretofore been supposed—the truth being that the region is for the most part *lower* than the surrounding drift-covered country—but to the fact that the glaciers have been deflected from it by the Lake Michigan and Green Bay depressions upon one side, and by the greater trough of Lake Superior and its transverse branches, Keweenaw and Chagwamagon Bays, on the other. Mr. Strong's report on the Lead Region is given for the most part in the shape of atlas-maps, showing both its geology and topography in the greatest detail. Plate xvi. of the atlas by Mr. Strong covers a region of about 3,000 square miles, and exceeds in accuracy and closeness of detail, we believe, any similar map ever published in this country. The maps are all very fine, the chromo-lithographic work being unusually well done. The volume is throughout a Wisconsin publication, and indicates the excellent facilities now obtainable in the West for such work. The remaining volumes of the series (vols. i. and iii.) are to be issued, we believe, the present year. We would suggest to those whose duty it may be to attend to such matters the incompleteness of the table of contents and index of this volume.

—An anonymous writer in the February *Atlantic* argues, in the opening article, "The Cradle of the Human Race," in favor of the autochthonous origin of the various peoples of Europe. Mr. W. H. Babcock asks how the loss of models by the fire in the Patent Office last year is to be repaired, and proposes that they be reproduced as far as possible from the drawings not destroyed, and that additions be allowed on satisfactory evidence before a special tribunal that they formed part of the original models. It appears to us a fatal objection to this plan that no tribunal could be devised which could be trusted to decide such momentous questions on purely ex-parte testimony. Not only could inventors not afford to be present to contest claims on which their fortunes depend, and perhaps remotely and obscurely depend, but the public would be entirely excluded, to its certain detriment. The ordinary courts are, in fact, the only places in which to prove the construction of destroyed models, since only there exist the necessary conditions for ascertaining the truth—viz., a real issue of fact and conflict of interest, and an opportunity for both sides to be heard and examined. The most substantial article in this number, and the best one, too, in a literary point of view, is Prof. Norton's "Venice and St. Mark's." The double title indicates the writer's

purpose to connect the history of the city with that of the church, to show how this wonderful building reflected the independence, enterprise, and originality of the Venetians, and their peculiar gift of color in architecture as in painting, and to reproduce from the old chroniclers some of the historic scenes associated with St. Mark's. The treatment of this interesting subject is kept free from technicalities.

—The even tenor of *Harper's Magazine*, which neither midsummer nor midwinter nor holidays nor the occasion of a new volume disturbs, is well exemplified in the February number. It differs in physiognomy from a great many numbers that we can remember, and yet it is fairly typical of the magazine. The opening paper, "Along our Jersey Shore," so far as it relates to the Life-saving Service, has a somewhat threadbare theme, but the story is agreeably retold and not uselessly—that would be impossible while the service is still so grudgingly supported by Congress. For the rest, Mr. Rideing describes a cruise along shore and in Barnegat Bay as far as Atlantic City, and makes his readers disposed to wish they too might spend a vacation in the same way. In "The Dunmow Flitch" Mr. M. D. Conway amusingly tells how the flitch in question was by an old institution annually awarded in Dunmow, Essex, England, to any couple who could take oath that a year after their marriage they could look back on no disagreement, and still desired each other above all possible spouses in the universe. This truly English custom, albeit, as Mr. Conway shows, not without its roots in a pagan and superstitious antiquity, was dropped in 1772, and revived by the novelist Ainsworth in 1855, and has been fitfully maintained ever since. Mr. Conway witnessed the serio-comic festival last year, and thinks there will never be another. The flitch, whatever its mythologic origin, "is now a side of bacon which would bring ninepence a pound, and all the enthusiasm of Dunmow, as it was seen borne aloft, was superficial compared with the sensation which would be produced could it some day see such bacon marked sixpence in a shop-window." The sketch of J. M. W. Turner's life recites the principal facts in his career, and mentions almost all the defects of his character as a man. The woodcuts after his pictures seem to us noticeably successful, including "The Old Téméraire" and "The Slave-ship," now for the first time popularized in print. Mr. Ruskin's well-known description of this canvas is of course cited, and the editor of *Harper's* is fair enough to allow our artist countryman, Mr. George Inness, in the course of some sensible remarks about painting, on a subsequent page, to record his opinion that Turner's "Slave-ship" is "the most infernal piece of clap-trap ever painted. There is nothing in it. It has as much to do with human affections and thought as a ghost. It is not even a fine bouquet of color. The color is harsh, disagreeable, and discordant." Mr. Inness's "interviewer" evidently took his notes in short-hand.

—We have rarely seen a more notable disregard of the economy of force, or a greater disproportion of means to ends, than in certain bills for "the classification of mail matter" drawn by the Post-office Department and introduced in the House by Mr. Money and in the Senate by Mr. Ferry. The object is to get rid of the annoyance of restraining certain advertising periodicals which endeavor to distribute themselves to non-subscribers at "privileged" rates of postage, and to silence the publishers of magazines who are annoyed at a recent rule restricting them from stitching or pasting in "inserts" or slips. To accomplish this it is actually proposed to create the office of "Superintendent of Mail Classification," who is to examine all printed matter claiming transmission at "privileged" rates, and who, if satisfied as to its character, is to issue "certificates of registration," under which it will be entitled to be sent to *bona fide* subscribers at the lowest rate of postage. The opportunities which such an official would have of levying blackmail or of persecuting political opponents are enlarged by a provision, very proper in itself, prohibiting the mailing of any "obscene matter or matter relating to lotteries, gift concerts, or fraudulent schemes and devices." A careful scrutiny of the advertising columns of any of the "great dailies" would doubtless reveal much which a censor of strict virtue could classify under one or more of the above heads, and he would have power at once to deprive the offender of mail privileges. The department, of course, has no intention of setting up an indirect censorship of the press, but if this machinery is created it will not be long before some of the "war-horses" will discover how advantageously it could be worked. At present the only motive lurking under the surface would seem to be the desire of some one to occupy an office created by Act of Congress, to which is attached a salary of \$2,250 per annum, to be paid out of the fees of registration.

—With the number for December 20, 1877, the French folk-lore

periodical *l'Alusine* terminated the first year of its existence. Among its most noteworthy contents we may mention the popular tales from various provinces of France. While all the other countries of Europe have displayed great activity in collecting their nursery tales, France has until recently almost entirely neglected them. The *Alusine* has contained stories from Brittany, Picardy, Amiens, Metz, etc., some of them rendered doubly valuable by the annotations of R. Köhler. Bruyère has contributed Creole tales, one of which, from the parish of St. John the Baptist, La., is the same as the story of the Wolf and the Rabbit in *Lippincott's Magazine*, Dec., 1877 ("Folk-Lore of the Southern Negroes"). A large number of *chansons* has been published with music, many being interesting variants of well-known songs—e. g., the "Chanson de Renaud," which is found from Brittany to Catalonia and Italy—while others are published for the first time. Next in value is the department of *Formulettes*, or nursery rhymes of all kinds, affording a rich material for comparison with German and English collections. Riddles are given from various localities, and superstitions have not been neglected. M. Bonnet contributes "Medical Superstitions of Franche-Comté," running through four numbers, and containing much that is common to all Europe. M. Thiriat furnishes "Beliefs, Superstitions, Prejudices, Uses, and Customs in the Department of Vosges," occupying three numbers. Several articles have been devoted to the traditional costumes of France, with illustrations, among them the curious dress worn at Bourg de Batz (Loire-Inférieure) by women at the ceremony of "churching," the head-dresses used in the Department of the Eure, etc. Of considerable value is the dictionary of names given to the inhabitants of the different localities of France prepared by M. Malet and running through the whole year. In addition to the above articles there has been an immense number of shorter articles and notes on local superstitions and customs, including an interesting note by M. Renan on the legend of the Seven Sleepers in Brittany. We must not omit mention of the department of reviews, with its notices of books of various countries relating to folk-lore. The *Alusine* is successfully established, and will prove indispensable to all students of folk-lore, and we shall probably see this year a kindred publication in England as the organ of the new English Folk-Lore Society.

STEPHEN'S FREETHINKING AND PLAINSPEAKING.*

THESE essays are thoroughly English; full of sturdy Saxon vigor, and yet not unaffected in some ways by the conservatism which so especially hedges in the topics treated of. In style they are near of kin to Gregg's first essays, and to Fitz James Stephen's. They have not the passion or the imagination that one would find in the work of an American radical reformer; but then the American would hardly have thought it necessary to write a book in favor of free thought. It is so much less of an effort in this country to think freely, even if the thought is as radical as Mr. Stephen's, and mere plainspeaking is so quietly received, that our radicals have often to excite themselves to extravagance in order to reach a really comfortable martyrdom. But on the other side of the water damnation is still so freely accorded that a moderately-framed opposition has an effect denied it here. Then, too, the radical writings of the two countries show something of the same contrast that affects their other writings—there a solid, steady movement, striving to settle once for all the points touched with exhaustive scientific completeness, here a brilliant imaginative appeal, addressed as much to the aesthetic taste as to the reason, and strongly colored by our national desire to get thought without the trouble of thinking.

These essays (with an exception or two) first appeared in *Fraser's Magazine* and the *Fortnightly Review*, and in the interval between the first and the last there seems to be a change from a rather cautious to a very outspoken position, though the latter is plainly enough foreshadowed in the earlier writings. The first four and the concluding essay especially form a series which either attempts, with extraordinary care, to lead the reader quietly on to a positivism more and more pronounced at each step, or else, as seems much more probable from Mr. Stephen's temperament, shows a development of his own convictions. The deliberate moderation with which he questions the fairness of the position of the Broad Church in retaining the old forms while rejecting the old substance, ripens into harsher criticism upon those who would cultivate religion as a fine art when they can no longer yield it their faith; the relation of modern science to the older faiths emphasizes more distinctly his radicalism, and at last he ends by stoutly refusing the name of Christian, and vigorously

* "Essays on Freethinking and Plainspeaking. By Leslie Stephen." New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1877. Pp. 162.

asserting the duty of avowing his radicalism. His position is so extreme that he is no doubt right in expecting the approval of few Englishmen but those who already agree with him; but they will appreciate the vigor of his thoughts and the straightforwardness of their utterance, while those who take the other side will find little that is absolutely new to trouble them. The allusion on page 87 to "some contemptible French author," who explains the origin of modesty by referring it to a savage instinct, is an unnecessary bit of sentimentality from any point of view. M. Littré, who is the author of the suggestion, is well known as the greatest of Comte's followers; and his theory, or something closely akin to it, is essential to every natural theory of man's intellectual rise from savagery. But sentimentalism is not at all one of Mr. Stephen's faults. He is indeed very English, and the atmosphere in which he writes is always to be borne in mind. The social influence of the Church, and the partial ostracism which radicalism has to meet there, make concealment much commoner than here; and render it less extraordinary that a man of Mr. Stephen's ability should think that he must discard the name of Christian in order to preserve his honesty.

In this country the position of the English Church has always been different from its native one. From the first it has been essentially a missionary church among the heathen, and it is to-day more marked for the extraordinary intensity with which it preserves its faith in beliefs that are quietly fading from the creeds of its competitors, and the warm zeal with which it seeks to draw the unbeliever into its fold, than for its liberalism or progress. Of course there are broad thinkers within its borders, as every great city can show, but they do not form as prominent and influential a party here as in England. The rejection of the political compromise from which the Church sprang seems to have given it a fresher life here; and in religion new life generally means firmer hold of doctrine, and stronger conviction that only faith can save. There have been comparatively few representatives of that section of the Broad party which, when the old methods seemed to be failing, boldly ventured to essay the new, and professed to bring the best light of historical criticism and of scientific investigation to bear upon the old dogmas only the better to exhibit their strength. As a movement it was scarcely in accord with the Church here, or indeed with our national instincts, from which the taste for the intellectual discussion of dogmas that our fathers felt so strongly has nearly departed. But even in England it did not succeed. The new wine was too effervescent. It was not, as Mr. Stephen says, because the English creed was, like the English constitution, "the product of a series of compromises, accidents, and bit-by-bit reforms, carried out by no definite principle, but by a sort of indefinite rule of thumb." However true it may be of the constitution, this does not at all represent the growth of the Church. When the Protestant creeds first took shape, the profoundest and subtlest thought of the time still found its best field in such topics. If we consider them unassisted by inspiration, we must still the more acknowledge the transcendent genius of the creation, for each of the great creeds is a perfect logical whole. Starting with its primal assumption that the collective voice of the Church was the voice of God, there was no assailable point in the Catholic creed. And when the stern facts compelled our fathers to doubt the purity of the Church's conscience and reject its authority, they still felt the need of an unquestionable source, and naturally sought and found it in the written Word. They did not go to history or science for evidences of Christianity. The "thus God spake" was final, and the Protestant creed which they built up on it (which, despite a few anomalies, is the creed of the English Church) is harmonious and complete. There would have been an impossible anachronism in supposing that the certainty of these *à priori* foundations could be replaced by any abstruse metaphysical probabilities or vague analogies from natural science. And to-day, much as philosophy and science may do, the certainty of the old faith they cannot give. Modern science has sadly shaken the belief in this infallibility of the holy text, both as to facts and laws. Modern thought has moved away from the creeds, but, however we may regret it, we cannot bring it back by scientific formulas with which they had nothing in common. The Broad Church has not been able to restrain the power it invoked, and again, as in the old legend, the dwarfs cry out that the Siegfried hammer has struck with such crushing energy that metal and anvil are driven into the earth.

The other liberal movement, which asserted that the creed was full of insoluble mysteries, was more successful here. This position had great advantages. It easily disposed of any troublesome points by calling them inscrutable. Of course antiquarians knew well enough that the great thinkers who worked out the creed would have stared in holy horror at the idea that they had left anything spiritually unintelligible or obscure, but

modern thought has swept away from them so far that many thinkers, some even of the leading philosophers of the time, have easily followed the suggestion of the Church, and indolently asserted the impossibility of understanding them; and naturally the method has found great favor in this country, especially in the more liberal sects. In the end, however, this movement, too, must fail, for the great creeds are great wholes from which no part can be severed without perilling the whole. The old legend comes back of the vigil in the valley of St. John, where the knight waits long before the enchanted castle, and at last in impotent, desperate uncertainty dashes his axe against the charmed rock, and finds that with the fall of a single turret the charm has broken and the whole castle lies open. The great creeds were the life of the Christian Church, and it is vain to hope that the Church can retain its influence when it does not insist upon the exclusive power of its creed to save. If the dogmas are acknowledged to be unimportant, men will give but a lax and indolent support to the church which so acknowledges its impotence. Belief must be in something definite and something certain, and it must be all-important. This is what has made Episcopacy and its offspring, Methodism, so successful of late years in this country. It has been perfectly sure. With all our loose breadth we crave sometimes something firmer, right or wrong, or rather something about which there can be no question of right or wrong. Keen as our artistic perceptions are, we are not always satisfied with "that beautiful but shadowy region where romance takes the place of history and poetry of reasoning."

For those who are unable to retain the old faith, but afraid to relinquish it, there is little satisfaction in books like Mr. Stephen's, which only try to show the untenableness of a foothold that they fear to change. The half conviction of insecurity they do not wish to recognize. They dislike to be told that "the division between faith and reason is a half measure till it is frankly admitted that faith has to do with fiction and reason with fact." Yet it is exactly against these half-way believers that Mr. Stephen's book is aimed. He has nothing to say against those who can still adhere fully to the old faith. He is too far away from them to meet them. He half unwillingly recognizes for a moment or two the other extreme of philosophical theism, the doctrine that the God-intoxicated Spinoza gave the clearest form to, but which is as old as the oldest thought—that philosophy which retains the direct personal knowledge of the divine essence, the all-informing eternal substance, "path, motive, guide, original, and end," while it drops all other dogmas. But he touches it only for an instant, for he himself goes further and keeps nothing. But still the old beliefs cover the whole ground, and one watches with interest the close approach of the modern positivist to the ancient stoic; a likeness of thought rather than feeling it is true, but still a striking one. Both worship the Universal Nature, refusing any further step in Divine definition. Both seek the true life in harmony with universal order. Both make their aim the universal good. "Never repent," says Mr. Stephen, "unless by repentance you mean drawing lessons from past experience. Beating against the bars of fate you will only wound yourself and mar what yet remains to you." The love of those we have lost "is at best an enervating enjoyment, and a needless pain. The figments of theology are a consecration of our delusive dreams; the teaching of the new faith should be the utilization of every emotion to the bettering of the world of the future." Instead of the utter self-surrender of Christianity Mr. Stephen puts the dignity of self-culture; instead of asceticism, the training one's instincts "into harmony with the interests of the whole social organism." Resignation, where there is a choice is but an "ignoble yielding to evils which might be extirpated." Suffering is an evil to be conquered, or at least stoically withstood, not a punishment to be submitted to; and our reward lies not in any immortality of personal bliss but in the good we have done, "spreading in widening circles to all eternity." We have but to clothe these thoughts in Latin to transport ourselves to that early time when Christianity was still struggling for existence, and stoicism seemed the only resource.

POOR'S 'MONEY AND ITS LAWS.'*

WE have hesitated a good deal about reviewing Mr. Poor's book—first, because to review it adequately would require a volume of at least half its size; and secondly, because it is quite plain that in Mr. Poor's opinion no man who has yet written on economical questions is competent to review it. Of its 623 capacious pages only 61 are devoted to what is undoubtedly the most important part of it—in fact, the reason for its

* 'Money and its Laws. Embracing a History of Monetary Theories and a History of the Currencies of the United States. By Henry V. Poor.' New York: H. V. & H. W. Poor. 1877.

existence—the author's account of his "Laws of Money." Of the remainder, 366 are given up to what it is no exaggeration to call scurrilous abuse of some of the most noted writers on economical questions, beginning with Aristotle and ending with David A. Wells. Aristotle he considers the father of modern political economy, and abuses roundly, though for reasons which we have no space to give here. We think his acquaintance with him, except in Behn's translation of the "Politics," is very slight. "The premises from which he reasoned," Mr. Poor says, "were the untrained observations of phenomena or the extravagant pictures of an ardent and fanciful mind." "The conclusions were as grotesque and fanciful" as the premises, and he finally declares with much solemnity that when Plato and Aristotle "came to be authorities in the Church as well as in the Schools a night of intense darkness settled over Europe," a circumstance which he considers by no means "strange." Of Aristotle the Schoolmen were "the legitimate descendants," and all modern economists, except Mr. Poor, are the legitimate descendants of the Schoolmen. It ought to be put down to the credit of Aristotle, however, that in spite of the great increase of light in the world within the last two thousand years, the leading modern economists are just as great fools as their master, except John Locke, who appears to have written soundly on the currency, though even his distinction is not very great, because "he is the only writer on the subject of the currency, except Law, who has not assumed, much less attempted to prove, that two and two make five." Even he, however, "did commit an unpardonable offence, with the Schoolmen," of course. What it was it is hardly necessary to state, in view of the gross and asinine stupidity of those who came after him. John Law gets some faint praise and had some glimmerings of reason, so that Adam Smith and others were able "to construct from the ruins he left behind their grotesque and absurd edifices." Hume comes next, and, like Aristotle, "assumes all his premises without consideration or reflection," and "always follows Law where he is wrong and rejects him wherever he is right." "With Hume," too, "from the perversity or credulity of human nature, a falsehood plausibly told and well stuck to would have all the potency of truth," which is a sorry showing for the great experimental philosopher. Moreover, "as far as any knowledge of monetary science is concerned, a Kaffir might be quoted" (as well as he) "for an authoritative opinion upon the Code of Menu." Poor Hume! Such is fame.

Hume, however, was not, according to our author, half as great a blockhead as Adam Smith, who even outdid in folly and stupidity his master Aristotle. His economical teachings are nothing but "errors and absurdities." He even went so far as in his illustrations "to invert the whole order of nature"—a dastardly and mischievous trick. He hardly wrote a line without making a blunder, because "he was by nature wholly unfitted to conduct a scientific discussion of any kind"; and, "considering his ignorance upon the subject on which he wrote, the groundlessness of his assumptions and conclusions, especially in reference to money, the influence he has exerted is well fitted to excite astonishment"—in Mr. Poor, of course. Next comes the unfortunate Dugald Stewart, whose absurdity is only to be matched by Aristotle, by the Schoolmen, and by modern economists, and three-fourths of whose writings his literary executor ought to have burnt as "a vast mass of rubbish." Huskisson too, acute as he was, could not help making a fool of himself. He "fell into the grossest absurdity for want of a little reflection," and by "accepting dogmas which he never examined." The celebrated Bullion Committee turned out nearly as badly as Aristotle and the Schoolmen. One of their main propositions was "purely imaginary" and "an absurdity on its face," and the report itself has been "one of the most formidable obstacles to the progress of monetary science." Ricardo, if possible, outdid all his predecessors in stupidity, even Smith, for "no sooner did he take up his pen to write on monetary topics than he seemed instantly discharged of all reasoning faculty. In the same sentence he could affirm propositions exactly opposed the one to the other without the least perception of their incongruity"; and by way of illustrating the mental condition of the Economists, Mr. Poor mentions that this unhappy person "occupies the front rank amongst them as an original and profound thinker." The leading witnesses before the Bullion Committee "made statements and drew conclusions as groundless as, and far less valuable than, the speculations of the alchemists." The state of Lord Overstone's mind while he was before the committee was "wild and incoherent," and he got the mind of the committee into the same condition. Mr. Goulburn, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, uttered stuff "for which a schoolboy should be punished."

Another foolish person was Tooke, the author of the "History of

Prices," "one of whose fallacies ought to have been palpable to the dullest comprehension," and who devoted the greater part of one thousand pages to proving certain propositions "still more absurd." As to J. R. McCulloch, his assumptions are "the dreams or vagaries of persons bereft of all sense in reference to the subjects to which they relate, and who unfortunately are wholly impervious to reason." For him and the other Scotch economists Mr. Poor feels mingled pity and contempt. Not one of them, "although among the most distinguished of their race, can conduct an argument on money through a single paragraph without involving themselves in the grossest mistakes and contradictions." To what, he not unnaturally asks, is "this apparent feebleness of intellect due"? The answer is, "to the uniformity in religion and dogma which has so long prevailed in their country."

As to John Stuart Mill, suffice it to say that he was "incapable of scientific enquiry," had "a puerile mind" and "an infirm temper." Macleod's writings on economical questions are "flippant and incoherent nonsense," to which "it will not be necessary to reply until Dr. Schliemann shall have dug up Dutch cheeses at Troas or Mycenæ, perfectly fresh and sweet." J. W. Gilbart wrote voluminously on money "without any comprehension of its nature and laws." Mr. Fawcett is all wrong, of course, but not such an egregious ass as Macleod and Bonamy Price. As to Stanley Jevons, he is so foolish, "inadequate, and unphilosophical" that he "does not call for comment"; but "there is a lower depth than even he has sounded, and that has been touched by Bonamy Price." Mr. Poor apologizes for quoting from Price's lectures, but says "it may do some good to show the incoherent buffoonery taught in the name of political economy in one of the first universities in Christendom." The American writers need only brief treatment, as they "simply repeat, without a particle of originality or independence," what they find in the books written on the other side of the water. Professor Bowen is perhaps the silliest of them, and is "feeble and garrulous." Sumner and Perry are disposed of with contemptuous brevity, and David A. Wells is accused of "flippant nonsense."

We had intended making some examination of the author's "Laws of Money," which is, as we have said, the excuse for this large and pretentious book, but, after the above citations, we feel sure our readers will excuse our not undertaking it. A writer whose mind is in the condition indicated by Mr. Poor's language is clearly not qualified for the discovery of any "laws" or the prosecution of any scientific enquiry. As he is evidently not a person with whom it is necessary to mince matters, however, we will say, after a careful reading of his exposition, that in our opinion he does not know the meaning of the terms "induction," or "deduction," or "dialectics"; that he has never been taught to reason at all; that he thinks himself "inductive" when he is floundering in the deepest *à priori* bogs; that he has apparently read far more than he can digest, and that he has produced, all things considered, the most foolish and discreditable book which has issued from the American press for many years; and we would warn foreign readers that there is nothing in the author's position at home to warrant or excuse his abusive and insolent treatment of any writer, ancient or modern.

Reminiscences and Anecdotes of Daniel Webster. By Peter Harvey. (Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1877.)—We have been somewhat disappointed in reading this volume. From the intimate relations which existed between Mr. Harvey and Mr. Webster, and from the greatness of the latter's career, and the interest of the public questions with which he had to deal, and many of which he had to settle, we anticipated finding in his friend's recollections a valuable collection of anecdote and reminiscence. But it is only too evident after reading a very few pages of the book that the author was not equal to his task. The requisite love and admiration of his subject he possessed, but the equally necessary powers of criticism and judgment he had not. There is something pathetic in the fidelity of his friendship, something almost canine in his unintellectual and undiscriminating loyalty. But the picture he gives of Mr. Webster is, we have no hesitation in saying, neither accurate nor characteristic. Mr. Harvey's Webster is a strange character—a combination of the acute lawyer, the far-seeing statesman, and the steady-going farmer, living a frugal and abstemious life, enjoying a large income and extremely punctilious about money matters, yet with a heavy incubus of debt on his shoulders all his life long; a man with a keen sense of humor, yet whose jests are, when repeated by their admirer, flat and stale to the last degree; a paragon of virtue and intellect, and the most popular politician of his time, whose career culminated in failure. Mr. James Parton

published not many years ago, in the *North American Review*, a picture of Webster in very different colors. Mr. Parton's Webster was an able and ambitious man, destitute of principle, involved in debt through his want of self-control, having no more conscience about money than the *ronks* of Sheridan's time, who sold his political soul for a mess of pottage, and finally went to preordained ruin in the due course of events.

Mr. Parton exaggerated his case as far in one direction as Mr. Harvey has done in the other. Mr. Webster had his virtues and his defects, and we do not think the time has yet come, even at a distance of twenty-five years from his death, for an altogether impartial estimate of them. Of one thing there can be no manner of doubt: he was a great advocate and publicist. He had the rare merit in a lawyer of being equally persuasive with judges and juries. His arguments on questions of constitutional and general law had a most profound and far-reaching effect in the development of the system of law dependent upon the written Constitution under which this country has reached its present growth. His diplomatic despatches are models. He lived in a time of great lawyers: Marshall, Kent, Story, Mason, Choate, Shaw, and Wirt are all distinguished names at the American bar, and it is with such names that Webster's must be compared, as in the case of all the great lawyers who have had an important share in the permanent settlement of principles, and not attained their reputation by mere ingenuity or learning. The chief characteristic of his mind was perfect clearness and sound judgment. His argument in the Dartmouth College case is founded on the simplest and most elementary principles of justice; and the positions he assumed as Secretary of State on the right of search were, as Mr. Harvey says, such that when stated there seems to be no possible doubt about them. It is curious to find him in his discussion of it anticipating the case of the *Virginus*, which proved such a puzzle to so many lawyers of a later day. The right of search, as contended for by the English Government, in Mr. Webster's view had no existence, for the simple reason that a regularly documented American vessel, flying the American flag, was part of American territory, and search of her was merely an act of trespass. But if the vessel be flying the flag without right—as, for instance, in the case of a pirate—she is not an American vessel, and it is nothing to us whether she is searched or not searched. Had this rule been applied to the *Virginus* case at the outset, the absurd idea that we had been insulted by Spain would have been seen to be without foundation.

It is impossible to read even the poorest life of Webster at the present time without being struck with the fact that for such a man there would now be literally no place in public life, and that even at the bar the race of legal giants to which he belonged has almost died out. In a measure this is doubtless due to the fact that public work once done cannot be done over again. The Constitution has been interpreted and the Government established on a sure foundation once and for all. The enormous industrial development which set in about the time that Webster's generation had reached maturity, and which had no effect on the early development of their minds or characters, has produced a new race of lawyers and of public men; lawyers who devote all their ability—of which the total amount available in the community is probably quite as great as it ever was—to service of the interests of great corporations, interests which generally require skilful advocacy and great ingenuity, but devotion to which does not tend to develop profound lawyers. Meanwhile influences whose operation is now so well understood as to excite little or no attention have weakened the judiciary till lawyers of the calibre of Marshall or Shaw will not go upon the bench, and public life has ceased to offer to men of elevated ambition and self-respect an attractive career. It is curious to speculate on what Webster would have been had he belonged to a later generation. Popular as he was during the greater part of his life in Massachusetts, he would not have had the requisite "magnetism" to succeed now. The popularity of that day was inspired partly by a feeling of reverence and awe both for intellectual greatness and social position which the rapid progress of demagogism since his death has almost totally destroyed. He had not the feelings or tastes which would allow him to associate with his intellectual or social inferiors on the terms of equality now exacted in politics. In law he would have been for the last twenty years on the unsuccessful side in all constitutional arguments. Were he alive now, with his intense ambition and love of success, we should not be surprised at finding him engaged in almost any form of prominent activity—except that in which he distinguished himself when living.

History of Guilford, Connecticut, from its first settlement in 1639. From the MSS. of Hon. Ralph D. Smith. (Albany: Joel Munsell. 1877.)

—A little country town sixteen miles from New Haven, on Long Island Sound, settled by farmers from Kent and Surrey, Guilford appears to have had an utterly uneventful history. The land was honestly bought of the Indians, the last purchase being confirmed by Uncas, the famous Mohegan chief, in 1641. The settlers obtained a good wheat and corn-bearing soil, excellent quarries of trap and granite, the best oysters on the Sound, and the aboriginal shell-heaps, which supplied an abundance of artificial manure. Numerous attempts to give a manufacturing character to the place have failed, but some ships have been built, and there is a prosperous iron-foundry. The "mayne end" of the fathers of Guilford (the third settlement in the colony of New Haven) was to "uphold the ordinances of God in an explicit *Congregational church way* with most *purity, peace, and liberty* for the benefit both of ourselves and posterities after us." They therefore excluded non-church-members from the government—the common Puritan polity, and not noteworthy here except that from Guilford and the adjoining town of Branford went those uncompromising come-outers who saw in the union of the Connecticut and New Haven colonies an abandonment of the polity, and who, in founding Newark, New Jersey, made a last vain effort for "the carrying on of spiritual concerns, as also of civil and town affairs, according to God and a godly government." In the mere spirit of adventure, too, Guilford proved an actively swarming hive, sending colonists to all parts of Connecticut, to Berkshire County, Mass., to Guilford (Windham County) and Chittenden County, Vt., to Charlemon and Charleston, N. H., to Greenville, N. Y., etc. Most important of all, Francis Austin, of Guilford, is the reputed ancestor of the notorious Stephen F. Austin, the founder of the present State of Texas.

Schools were established as soon as the church was; a library in 1737; the first newspaper in March, 1877. The great literary lights of the town were Dr. Samuel Johnson, the first president of King's (now Columbia) College and father of William Samuel, a later president of the same institution; and Fitz-Greene Halleck, whose descent through his mother from John Eliot is perhaps as deserving of mention as that of other fact, that he "was the first American poet to whom was awarded the honor of a bronze statue in a public place"—and such a statue! Abraham Baldwin, member of the Federal Constitutional Convention and subsequent U. S. Senator; Thomas Chittenden, first governor of Vermont; and S. B. Chittenden, the present Representative in Congress, are the chief of Guilford's politicians and statesmen. The town is thought to have the oldest dwelling-house now standing in the United States, dating from 1639, though this pretension will be disputed: the Cradock house in Medford, Mass., is assigned to 1634. Longevity is predicated of the people also. In the early days the town was its own physician, purchasing its medicines out of the common funds, and unanimously voting "yea" in special town-meeting on the question "whether the inhabitants would buy Mrs. Cosser's Physic and Physical drugs." Lawyers have only lately obtained a foothold in Guilford, which boasts that none of its inhabitants was ever hung.

The late Judge Smith left a genealogy of the principal Guilford families, and several works of a like nature, which certainly ought to be published. The profits from the sale of the present volume inure to the benefit of the "United Workers for Public Improvement," an admirable organization of ladies for the purpose of beautifying the town.

Who and What. A Compendium of General Information. Compiled by Annah De Pui Miller. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1878.) —Mrs. Miller's compendium of general information has been compiled on no other principle than that of recording the answers to the various questions that came up in her desultory reading. The editor found the book of value to herself and to her friends, and certainly it contains a good deal of miscellaneous information. The reader can learn who was called "The Bard of Avon," what poem was composed amid the noise of hammers, what century was the age of thought, what great men died of the gout, what great man had epileptic fits; in short, the questions seem to regard nothing as too important and nothing as too trivial for enquiry. The answers, however, are much less thorough; in fact, errors are inexcusably frequent. For instance, on page 76, it is stated that Cervantes was born in 1519, and at the end of the paragraph we are told "he saw the light of day just three years before Shakespeare," who was born in 1564, while the true date of Cervantes's birth is 1547. On p. 62 is the question "Who wrote 'Arcadia'?" to which the strange answer is given, "Joseph Addison"; on p. 320, however, the book is ascribed to its author, Sir Philip Sidney. P. 266, Horace Walpole is called the wit and beau of the time of Madame Récamier, this lady being confounded with Madame du

Deffand. P. 277 contains the statement that Dr. Johnson was paid one thousand pounds for his 'Rasselas'; what he really received was one-tenth of that amount, with twenty-five pounds additional when the book reached a second edition. We are also treated with some singular criticism of Dr. Johnson: it is stated that "he was a great bore at times, and so very unprepossessing in appearance as to be frequently shunned, till by his perseverance he made people like him. . . . Notwithstanding these many drawbacks he was worshipped by Boswell, who proved himself a friend when all others deserted him." Elsewhere we are told that after reading Boswell's 'Life of Johnson' "one feels . . . that it might have been better for Johnson had his friend Boswell never been born." It is curious, too, to read about Tennyson that a "great deal that he has written is misty, obscure, and enigmatical," and that his longer poems "must be read and re-read to gather their meaning, and even then one is not always sure that he has the right one." Robert Browning is mentioned as "a poet of no mean pretensions," a rewriting of the verdict given in Cleveland's 'Handbook of English Literature,' where, in a biographical sketch of Mrs. Browning, she is said to have married "Robert Browning, himself no mean poet." In the few lines on Keats it is said that the famous article on "Eudymion" in the *Quarterly Review* was written by John Wilson Croker, but it is generally ascribed to Gifford; and then we find currency given to the grossly exaggerated statement of its effect upon Keats's life. The Madame Hanska whom Balzac married was a Russian and not a Polish lady, and Balzac married her in Russia and not in Poland, as is stated on p. 59. It seems hasty to assert, as is done on p. 396, that the thirteenth century "laid the foundation or root of all art," and that the next century was "the age of thought" because

"then lived Dante and Giotto." The statement on the next page that Dante and Petrarch were great friends is without foundation, for Dante died when Petrarch was but seventeen years old. One can only smile at the assertion, on p. 379, that the Babylonians were the people who first instituted the custom of sacrificing human victims to conciliate their gods. By a florin is not meant necessarily "an ancient gold coin of Edward III., of six shillings sterling value"; there are also modern coins of that name in Germany, Spain, Holland, and England. As used on p. 232, it would seem that it is the florin of South Germany which is meant, and this is equal to forty cents of our money. P. 13, the familiar line from Pope is misquoted; it should read:

"I hiss'd in numbers, for the numbers came."

Omniscience is not to be expected in the writer of a book like this, but there is no excuse for ignorance of the best authorities.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
American Newspaper Directory, swd.	Geo. P. Rowell & Co. \$1.
Church (H. W.), Beginning of the Middle Ages,	Erberner, Armstrong & Co. 1.50
Funerary (J. J.), My Intimate Friend: a Tale,	H. P. Lippincott & Co. 1.50
Felsenthal (H. B.), Zur Proselytenfrage im Judenthum, swd.	(P. H. B. B. B.)
Garland (Dr. C. M.), Pneumono-Dynamics, swd.	(Hurd & Houghton)
Gobneau (Comte de), Romances of the East,	(H. P. Lippincott & Co.)
Godwin (P.), Cyclopædia of Biography, B. W. ed.,	(H. P. Lippincott & Co.)
Italer (G.), Renée and France: a Tale,	(H. P. Lippincott & Co.)
Jennings (L. J.), Field Paths and Green Lanes,	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Medjell (G. T.), Tankevirksomhedens Lov, swd.,	(Christiana)
Moore (T.), Prose and Verse,	Erberner, Armstrong & Co. 2.50
Powell (A. M.), State Regulation of Vice,	Wood & Loeb Crook
Shaler (Prof. N. S.), Nature of Intellectual Property,	A. R. Osgood & Co.
Sherring (M. A.), The Hindoo Pilgrimage,	Trubner & Co.
Summer (J.), Speech Prepared for the U. S. Senate, March, 1871, swd.	(H. C. & H. C.)
Sunshine of Song,	(Oliver Dutton & Co.)
Taylor (P.), Primer of Pianoforte Playing,	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Wentworth (Prof. G. A.), Elements of Geometry,	(Appel & Heath)
War Correspondence of the Daily News, 1871,	(Macmillan & Co.) 2.50

RECENTLY PUBLISHED:

WALKER'S MONEY. 8vo, \$4.
 JOHNSON'S SINGLE FAIRY'S POEMS. \$2.
 THORNHURST'S LIFE OF T. M. W. TURNER, R.A. \$2.75.
 CRESSY'S OTTOMAN TURKS. \$2.50.
 MOYR-SMITH'S THE PRINCE OF ARGOLIS. \$2.
 WALKER'S WAGES QUESTION. Second edition. \$3.50.
 MCCOY'S EGYPT. \$1.
 TAYLOR'S ENGLISH LITERATURE. 1 vol., \$1.
 MAYENDIE'S DITA (Lecture-Hour Series). \$1.
 WHITNEY'S GERMAN DICTIONARY. \$3.50. The same in two vols., \$5.50.

HENRY HOLT & CO., NEW YORK.

Mr. Snider's work on Shakspeare has received the unqualified approval of the press East and West. Competent critics, who are accustomed to weigh their words, have spoken of its merits in the highest terms. It is pronounced one of the greatest works of literary criticism that has been written. It certainly is a work of literary criticism in a new vein, the first fruits of a comparatively new school of thought, which is destined to leave its impress upon the time.

The Whole Creation in Pain.

HENRY WARD BEECHER'S Sermon on "THE WHOLE CREATION IN PAIN" will appear in the *Christian Union* of January 30. No. 27 Park Place, New York City.

"One of the greatest that Mr. Beecher has ever preached from Plymouth pulpit."—*New York Times*.

BOOKS and PERIODICALS in FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

One of the largest Stocks in the Country. CATALOGUES ON APPLICATION.

SCHOENHOF & MOELLER.

Importers and Publishers, Boston.

F. W. CHRISTERN,

Foreign Bookseller and Importer,
 77 UNIVERSITY PLACE, NEW YORK.

The principal publications of Charpentier, Didier, Didot, Hachette, Levy, etc., on hand; also, complete sets of Tauchnitz's collection of British Authors and Teubner's Greek and Roman Classics. Catalogues mailed on demand. European Periodicals received weekly.

BACK NUMBERS AND COMPLETE SETS of all the leading MAGAZINES and REVIEWS for sale cheap, at the American and Foreign Magazine Depot, 24 Dev Street, New York City.

NOW READY.

Democracy
in Europe.

A History. By Sir THOMAS
 ERSKINE MAY, K.C.B., D.C.L.,
 author of the 'Constitutional History of England.' Two vols. 8vo,
 500 pages, cloth extra, gilt tops, \$5.

From Author's Preface.

"If any profession of political faith is expected, as a pledge of the spirit in which this history is written, it is this: I hail the development of popular power as an essential condition of the social advancement of nations; I am an ardent admirer of political liberty—of rational and enlightened liberty, such as most Englishmen approve; and I condemn any violation of its principles, whether by a despotic king or by an ill-ordered republic."

W. J. WIDDLETON, Publisher,

27 Howard Street, New York.

JUST PUBLISHED.

A VALUABLE WORK.

The Electoral System

OF
 THE UNITED STATES.

A Critical and Historical Exposition of its Fundamental Principles in the Constitution, and of the Acts and Proceedings of Congress enforcing it.

By DAVID A. MCKNIGHT.

8vo, extra cloth, \$2.

For sale by all booksellers, or will be sent by mail, post-paid, upon receipt of the price, by

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., Publishers,

715 and 717 Market Street, Philadelphia.

UNIVERSE OF LANGUAGE, Comprising the Spelling Reform, \$1.40
 Catalogue of new books and new Plan of Publishing, free.
 AUTHORS' FEB. CO., 27 Bond Street, New York

ORTHODOXY.

Third Volume of Boston Monthly Lectures.

By Joseph Cook. With Prefaces on Current Events. 12mo, \$1.50.

22ND 16TH EDITION

BIOLOGY.

BY JOSEPH COOK. \$1.50.

22ND 16TH EDITION

TRANSCENDENTALISM.

BY JOSEPH COOK. \$1.50.

"For searching philosophical analysis; for keen and merciless logic; for dogmatic assertion of a eternal truth in the august name of science, such as shudders the soul to its foundations; for widely extended and most apt illustrations drawn from a wide field of reading and observation; for true poetic feeling; for pathos, without any mixture of sentimentality; for candor; for moral elevating; and for noble loyalty to those great Christian virtues which the author affirms and vindicates: these wonderful lectures stand forth alone amidst the contemporary literature of the class to which they belong."—*London Quarterly Review*.

RELIGION IN CHINA.

Containing a Brief Account of the Three Religions of the Chinese; with Observations on the Prospects of Christian Conversion amongst that People. By Joseph Edkins, D.D. Volume X. of English and Foreign Philosophical Library. 1 vol. crown 8vo, \$2.50.

A work of positive and permanent value, by a writer who has enjoyed peculiar facilities for becoming acquainted with the religious, history, and character of the Chinese.

. For sale at all Bookstores. Sent, post-paid, on receipt of price, by the Publishers.

JAMES R. OSGOOD & CO., BOSTON.

A BOOK FOR THE TIMES.

Heaven and Hell.

Those in search of information about HELL should procure a copy of

HEAVEN AND ITS WONDERS;

AND

HELL.

FROM THINGS HEARD AND SEEN.

By EMANUEL SWEDENBORG.

12mo, 453 pp., cloth, \$1.50.

Of this important work by the great Swedish seer, over 15,000 copies have been called for during the past few years.

For sale by all booksellers, or will be sent by mail, post-paid, upon receipt of the price, by

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., Publishers,

715 and 717 Market Street, Philadelphia.

SILVER Plated Ware.

THE
Meriden Britannia Company,
46 EAST FOURTEENTH STREET
(UNION SQUARE)

AND
550 BROADWAY, NEW YORK,

Are Manufacturing and have on Exhibition a Choice Selection of Desirable Articles especially appropriate for Gifts.

CENTENNIAL MEDALS AND DIPLOMAS were awarded to this Company for "SUPERIOR" SILVER-PLATED WARE.

MICROSCOPES.

Spectacles, Spy-Glasses, Opera-Glasses, Microscopes, Telescopes, Stereoscopes, Barometers, Thermometers, Magic Lanterns, Drawing Instruments and Materials.

Price and Illustrated Catalogues as follows will be mailed to any address:

Part 1, Mathematical Instruments 158 pages.
Part 2, Optical Instruments 117 pages.

JAMES W. QUEEN & CO.,
No. 924 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

MICROSCOPES.

R. & F. BECK, *Manufacturing Opticians,* 921 Chestnut St., Philadelphia.
Invite your special attention to their unequalled stock of Microscopes, Telescopes, Opera Glasses, Spectacles, Eye Glasses, and Thermometers, at greatly reduced prices. Illustrated Catalogue mailed to any address.

Pratt's Astral Oil.

PERFECTLY SAFE.

Especially adapted for use in the St. Germain Student Lamp.

CHAS. PRATT & CO.,

Box 3050.

NEW YORK.

Letter from Sir Henry Halford, Captain of British Team.

GARDEN CITY HOTEL, CREEDMOOR, Sept. 17, 1877.

MESSRS. WM. S. KIMBALL & CO., Rochester, N. Y.:

GENTLEMEN: Pray accept my best thanks for the package of Vanity Fair Tobacco which I found here yesterday. It is the best tobacco I ever smoked, and will be a great source of enjoyment to me on my Western trip.

Believe me, yours truly,

H. S. J. HALFORD.

*Liverpool &
London & Globe
Insurance Co.,
45 William St.*

Hanover Fire Insurance Co

120 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Capital paid in in Cash \$500,000 00
Reserves for all liabilities, including reinsurance 533,489 45
Net surplus 509,393 14

Total assets \$1,642,882 59

R. S. WALCOTT, President.

I. REMSEN LANE, Secretary.

Atlantic Mutual INSURANCE CO.

NEW YORK, January 23, 1878.

The Trustees, in conformity to the Charter of the Company, submit the following Statement of its affairs on the 31st December, 1877.

Premiums received on Marine Risks from 1st January, 1877, to 31st December, 1877 \$4,710,665 83
Premiums on Policies not marked off 1st January, 1877. 2,040,362 61
Total amount of Marine Premiums \$6,751,028 44
No Policies have been issued upon Life Risks, nor upon Fire disconnected with Marine Risks.
Premiums marked off from 1st January, 1877, to 31st December, 1877 \$4,602,331 08
Losses paid during the same period \$2,565,850 27
Returns of Premiums and Expenses \$947,023 86

The Company has the following Assets, viz.:

United States and State of New York Stock, City, Bank, and other Stocks \$10,564,658 00
Loans, secured by Stocks and otherwise 1,163,200 00
Real Estate and Claims due the Company, estimated at 617,436 01
Premium Notes and Bills receivable 1,764,363 63
Cash in Bank 255,364 02
Total Amount of Assets \$14,366,351 66

Six per cent. interest on the outstanding certificates of profits will be paid to the holders thereof, or their legal representatives, on and after Tuesday, the Fifth of February, next.

The outstanding certificates of the issue of 1874 will be redeemed and paid to the holders thereof, or their legal representatives, on and after Tuesday, the Fifth of February, next, from which date all interest thereon will cease. The certificates to be produced at the time of payment and cancelled. Upon certificates which were issued for gold premiums the payment of interest and redemption will be in gold.

A dividend of forty per cent. is declared on the net earned premiums of the Company, for the year ending 31st December, 1877, for which certificates will be issued on and after Tuesday, the Seventh of May, next.

By order of the Board,

J. H. CHAPMAN, Secretary.

TRUSTEES.

J. D. Jones,
Charles Dennis,
W. H. H. Moore,
Lewis Curtis,
Chas. H. Russell,
James Low,
David Lane,
G. W. Burnham,
Daniel S. Miller,
Wm. Sturgis,
Josiah O. Low,
William E. Dodge,

Royal Phelps,
Thomas F. Youngs,
C. A. Hand,
John D. Hewlett,
William H. Webb,
Charles P. Burdett,
Francis Skiddy,
Alex. V. Blake,
Adolph Lemoyne,
Robert B. Minturn,
Chas. H. Marshall,
George W. Lane,

Robert L. Stuart,
Jas. G. De Forest,
Fred. Chauncey,
Chas. D. Leverich,
Horace Gray,
Edmund W. Corlies,
John Elliott,
William Bryce,
William H. Fogg,
Peter V. King,
Thomas B. Coddington,
Horace J. ...

J. D. JONES, President.
CHARLES DENNIS, Vice-
W. H. H. MOORE, 2d Vice-
A. A. RAVEN, 3d Vice-Pre

FOR FLORIDA
AND
ALL POINTS SOUTH
PASSENGERS AND FREIGHT

VIA NEW YORK AND SAVANNAH STEAMSHIP LINES,
Sailing from New York punctually at 3 P.M. every Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, and connecting at Savannah with

THE CENTRAL RAILROAD OF GEORGIA
to all points in Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi, and with the

ATLANTIC AND GULF RAILROAD
to all points in Florida, Southern and Middle Georgia, etc., and with the

GEORGIA AND FLORIDA INLAND STEAMBOAT CO.
Steamers: *City of Bridgeton* and *David Clark*. For Freight or Passage by Thursday's ships, apply to MURRAY, FERRIS & CO., Agents, 62 South Street. By Tuesday and Saturday's ships, apply to GEO. YONGE, Agent, 409 Broadway, and at Pier 43, North River. C. D. OWENS, Agent A. & G. R. R., 315 Broadway.

BROWN BROTHERS & CO.,
59 WALL STREET,
ISSUE COMMERCIAL AND TRAVELLERS' CREDITS
For use in
THIS COUNTRY AND ABROAD.

WINSLOW, LANIER & CO.,
BANKERS,
HAVE FOR SALE SECURITIES FOR SAFE AND PERMANENT INVESTMENT.

S. G. & G. C. WARD,
AGENTS FOR
BARING BROTHERS & COMPANY,
52 Wall Street, New York.
28 State Street, Boston.

WILLIAM T. MEREDITH,
37 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK,
DEALER IN INVESTMENT SECURITIES AND COMMERCIAL PAPER.

BANK OF CRESTON,
CRESTON, IOWA.
B. LOMBARD, JR. JAMES L. LOMBARD.
Mortgage Loans, carefully selected, bearing 8 and 9 per cent. interest, and secured on improved farms in Iowa.

New York City Bonds,
5, 6, and 7 Per Cent.,
MATURING 1878 TO 1926.

Missouri State 6s, MATURING 1897.
Jersey City 7s, MATURING 1886 TO 1917.

FOR SALE BY

GEO. K. SISTARE, 17 Nassau Street.

Wines, Pates, Etc.,

FOR FAMILY USE, CLUBS, MESS-ROOMS, YACHTS, AND TOURISTS.

Hocks, Absinthe,
Sauternes, Kirsch,
Sherries, Liqueurs,
Clarets, Patis de Fois Gras,
Burgundies, Potted Game,
Cognacs, Preserved Meats,
Whiskies, Saucisson,
Boneless Sardines.

CHAMPAGNES, SWEET, DRY, AND EXTRA DRY,
FLEUR MOUSSEUSE DE COGNAC,
STRUVE'S BRIGHTON SELTZER
AND APOLLINARIES WATERS

JOHN DUNCAN'S SONS,
UNION SQUARE.

**NORTH GERMAN LLOYD
STEAMSHIP COMPANY,**
FOR SOUTHAMPTON AND BREMEN.

The Steamers of this Company will sail every Saturday from Bremen Pier, foot of Third Street, Hoboken.

RATES OF PASSAGE TO LONDON, HAVRE, AND BREMEN.
First Cabin, \$100; Second Cabin, \$60 gold. Steerage, \$30 currency.
For Freight or passage apply to

OELRICHS & CO., AGENTS,
2 Bowling Green.

CUNARD LINE.
ESTABLISHED 1840.

FOR QUEENSTOWN AND LIVE POOL.

Sailing from New York every Wednesday. From Boston once a week.

RATES OF PASSAGE:

CABIN—\$80, \$100, and \$130, gold, according to accommodation.
Return tickets on favorable terms.
STEERAGE—\$25 currency. For freight or passage apply to

C. G. FRANKLYN,
Bowling Green, New York.

